

Library of
Central Baptist Theological Seminary

Classification

Accession

Gift

Purchase

Date

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Papers
of the
American
Society of Church History

Second Series

Volume II.

Report and Papers of the Second and Third Annual Meetings of the
Reorganized Society Held in New York City Dec. 29, 1908
and Dec. 30, 1909, Respectively

Edited by
Samuel Macauley Jackson
Secretary

G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York and London
The Knickerbocker Press
1910

COPYRIGHT, 1910
BY
SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

270.06

A512

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CONSTITUTION	v
THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING } Report of the . . .	I
THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING } Secretary. . .	8
THE ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, AT THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING: "THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FOUR THESES OF JOHN ECK" . . .	21
ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE 404 THESES . . .	37
By Henry Eyster Jacobs.	
THE BEGINNING OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH ON MANHATTAN ISLAND	85
By John Nicum.	
EARLY ATTEMPTS AT CHURCH UNION IN AMERICA . . .	105
By James Isaac Good.	
EARLY MINISTERIAL TRAINING IN AMERICA . . .	117
By Samuel Simpson.	
LUTHER AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS	133
By John Alfred Faulkner.	
THE ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, FRANCIS ALBERT CHRIS- TIE, AT THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING: "THE YEAR 1909 IN CHURCH HISTORY"	153
THE CHURCH AND MEDIEVAL TRADE-UNIONS . . .	177
By Edward Waite Miller.	

27082

	PAGE
THE EARLY DUTCH ANABAPTISTS	189
By Henry Elias Dosker.	
THE MARIAN EXILES	201
By George Edwin Horr.	
LIST OF MEMBERS	213
DECEASED MEMBERS	219

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

I.

This Society shall be called The American Society of Church History.

II.

Its object shall be the promotion of studies in the department of Church History.

III.

The officers shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be elected by ballot at the annual meeting.

No President shall be elected to succeed himself.

These officers, the ex-Presidents and two other members to be elected annually, shall constitute the Council, of which three shall be the quorum.

The Council may fill vacancies until the next annual meeting.

IV.

The duties of the persons just named shall be respectively as follows:

The President, or in his absence the Vice-President, shall preside at all meetings of the Society. In the absence of these officers, the Society may choose a temporary president from the members present.

The Secretary shall notify the members at least two weeks in advance of each meeting, keep the minutes, and conduct the correspondence of the Society under the direction of the Council.

The Treasurer shall send bills regularly to all annual members, take charge of the funds of the Society, and invest and disburse them under the direction of the Council.

The Council shall be charged with the general interests of the Society including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers, the arrangement of programs, the determination of papers to be published, and the auditing of the Treasurer's accounts.

V.

The members shall be either active or sustaining. The annual fee for active members shall be Three Dollars; for sustaining members, Ten Dollars. On payment of One Hundred Dollars at any one time any member may become a life-member exempt from fees.

VI.

One copy of each of the publications of the Society, issued after their election, shall be sent to all life-members, and to all other members not in arrears for more than two years, and to all libraries subscribing Three Dollars annually.

VII.

The Society shall meet annually at such time and place as the Council may determine. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the Council. Ten members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may sit for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE REORGANIZED AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

THE Society met for its second annual meeting since its reorganization in Room 311 of Havemeyer Hall, Columbia University, New York City, at 10.30 A.M., Tuesday, December 29, 1908. The President, Henry Eyster Jacobs, called the meeting to order and offered prayer. He then delivered the address on "The Four Hundred and Four Theses of Dr. John Eck" which is printed on the following pages.

He was followed by John Nicum, who read a paper on "The Beginning of the Lutheran Church on Manhattan Island," also printed in this volume. It was discussed by Messrs. Ewell, Corwin, and Johnson. The concluding paper of the session was by James Isaac Good on "Early Attempts at Church Union in America."

On motion, it was resolved that hereafter the Nominating Committee shall consist of the former presidents of the Society and the Secretary.

The Society then adjourned for luncheon in the university refectory.

The second session was opened in the same place at 3 P.M. The first paper was by Samuel Simpson on "Early Ministerial Training in America," and was discussed by Messrs. Walker, Richards, Ewell, Ayer, Rockwell, and Johnson. The concluding paper was by John Alfred Faulkner on "Luther and Economic Questions," and was

discussed by Messrs. Spaeth, Ayer, Rockwell, and Spieker.

At 6.30 P.M., the members met for dinner at the National Arts Club, 15 Gramercy Park. The third session then followed. The Secretary in the absence of the author read the paper of Henry Woodward Hulbert on "John Milton."

The business session came next. The Treasurer's report was as follows:

Income:

Balance on hand January 1, 1908.....	\$ 92.65	
Receipts during the year.....	121.00	\$213.65

Expenditures:

Jan. 13, Knickerbocker Press for printing	\$6.75	
May 15, D. R. Thompson for printing.	2.25	
Sep. 30, Red Diamond Press, advance on volume.....	100.00	
Dec. 28, Red Diamond Press, balance on volume.....	87.40	
Bank collection charges.....	.60	\$197.00
Balance on hand December 28, 1908.....	16.65	

This report of the Treasurer was accepted and ordered on file.

The Committee on Bibliography reported through William Walker Rockwell recommending that, inasmuch as the work of compiling a bibliography of American Church History is already one of the services of the Library of Congress, the Society do not undertake to duplicate this work, but rather co-operate with its advice in the direction of putting the bibliography on a wider basis.

This report was accepted, the recommendation adopted, and the committee continued for another year with the same membership.

The Committee on the Preparation of an American Church History reported through Williston Walker upon

the general plan, and Samuel Simpson presented his tentative outline of a scheme for such a history.

This report was accepted and the subject recommitted to the committee, with the same membership, for further study and report.

A discussion took place on the matter of preparing a source book of church history. The desirability of such a book was recognized. It appearing that Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., had such a book in preparation he was added to the committee and requested to present his proposed book at the next annual meeting.

The Secretary reported that on the last day of 1908 the Society had fifty-nine members; during the year thirteen had joined. During 1908 two of our members had died and to their memory a few words should be spoken.

ALEXANDER VIETS GRISWOLD ALLEN was born at Otis, Mass., Tuesday, May 4, 1841, and died in Cambridge, Mass., Wednesday, July 1, 1908. So he fell three years short of the Psalmist's term, but so full did he make his years that they counted for more than many a longer existence. He graduated at Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, in 1862, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1865. He founded the Protestant Episcopal church of Saint John's at Lawrence and was its rector from 1865 to 1867. He then accepted other service in his communion and was from 1867 till his death professor of church history in the Protestant Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass. As a teacher he impressed himself on his pupils, who bear grateful testimony to his enthusiasm, fulness of knowledge, and capacity to excite in them his interest in his subject. In other words he was a born teacher. As a writer he had a high reputation and the earliest of his publications has passed through many editions and been read on both sides of the sea and become in its way a classic. But all his books display clear thinking, wide reading, and independence.

He was an advocate of liberal views, and might have been a leader in the councils of his communion had he not studiously avoided controversy and debate. He stated his case and then let it make its own impression, not caring even to read what other men might have to say about it. His books are these: *The Continuity of Christian Thought: a Study of Modern Theology in the Light of its History*, Boston and New York, 1883. These were the Bohlen Lectures of 1883, and had as their main endeavor "to show that a purpose runs through the whole history of Christian thought, despite the apparent confusion which is to many its predominant characteristic." The book brought him the sobriquet of "Continuity Allen." After passing through ten editions it was in 1895 brought out in a new edition somewhat revised. It has had a useful career and is still in the market. Dean Hodges calls it "the most important contribution which has been made to theology by any American writer." His second appearance as the author of a book was in the biographical line, the life of *Jonathan Edwards*, Boston, 1889. It is one of the American Religious Leaders Series, and is a small volume, but the value of books does not depend upon their size and this one is excellent. It sets Edwards in his times and thus aids us to understand both. In March, 1894, he read two lectures before Yale University, and published them in 1895 under the title *Religious Progress* (Boston). The outline gives the clearest idea of the volume. First lecture: Religious progress in the experience of the individual. I. Definition of progress. II. Whether progress in religion is possible. III. The method of growth by reaction. IV. The theory of uniform development. V. The conception of progress implied in conservatism. Second lecture: Religious progress in the organic life of the church. I. An illustration of progress in the Catholic Church of the early centuries. II. The reconciliation of hostile attitudes in theology. III. The appeal to the past in all progressive

movements in the church. IV. Conclusion. As will be inferred from this outline he was himself a decided believer in religious progress both individually and in the church, and he maintains this position with remarkable learning and insight. His next publication was the volume entitled *Christian Institutions* (New York, 1897). It is a summary of the church's history from the point of view of its institutions. It attempts to show how organizations, creeds, and cultus are related to the spiritual life and to the growth of Christian civilization. The genesis of the book was a course of Lowell lectures delivered in 1892, but the printed book was a reworking of the theme. How it came to be incorporated into The International Theological Library, of Drs. Briggs and Salmond, in which it now appears, is not stated. Like the other books of Dr. Allen it displays wide learning and is attractive in style. In 1899, he issued his *Message of Christ to Manhood*, which is one of his minor writings. In 1900, he published by far the largest book he was ever connected with, *The Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks* (New York), in two thick octavo volumes. Bishop Brooks was his intimate friend. His *Continuity* was dedicated to him and the revised edition to his memory. This intimacy was both his advantage and his snare. His book was widely read as a full presentation of the great preacher and bishop, but many were forced to skip much of it because it contained so much that was unimportant. There was a general demand for a smaller book and this Dr. Allen supplied in 1907. His last publication bore the characteristic title, *Freedom in the Church* (New York, 1907). It was what he had pleaded for all his life. He received the degree of Doctor in Divinity from Harvard in 1880; and from Yale in 1901.

ABRAM HERBERT LEWIS, who was a member of the old Society and of its successor, died at Watch Hill, Rhode Island, on Tuesday, November 3, 1908. The immediate

cause of his death was reported to be blood-poisoning from an ulcerated tooth.

He was born at Scott, Cortlandt County, New York, on Thursday, November 17, 1836. He was educated at Milton College (Milton, Wisconsin) and at Alfred University (Alfred Centre, New York), and entered the ministry of the Seventh Day Baptist Church in 1864 and rose to occupy a foremost place, not only by his denominational activity, but by his authorship. His first pastorate was at Westerly, Rhode Island, from 1864 till 1867. He was in New York City from 1867 till 1869. He was pastor at Shiloh, N. J., from 1873 to 1876; from 1876 till 1880 he was professor of church history and homiletics in Alfred University; and general agent of the American Sabbath Tract Society from 1869 till 1873, vice-president from 1873 till 1881, one of the board of directors since 1881, and corresponding secretary from 1896 till his death. He was pastor at Plainfield, New Jersey, from 1880 till 1896. Besides editing at different times sundry denominational organs and thus performing eminent service he produced the following books in which the peculiar tenets of his co-religionists found authoritative statement: *The Sabbath and the Sunday*, Alfred Centre, N. Y., 1870; *Biblical Teachings concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday*, 1884, 2d ed. revised 1888; *A Critical History of the Sabbath and the Sunday*, 1886, 2d and revised ed. 1893; *The Seventh-day Baptist Handbook*, 1887; *A Critical History of Sunday Legislation*, New York, 1888, 2d and revised ed. 1891; *Why I am a Seventh-day Baptist*, 1891; *Paganism Surviving in Christianity*, 1892; *The Catholization of Protestantism on the Sabbath Question non-Protestant*, 1897; *Studies in Sabbath Reform*, 1898; *Swift Decadence of Sunday—What Next?* Plainfield, N. J., 1899; *The Time of Christ's Resurrection*, 1900; *Letters to Young Preachers and their Hearers*, 1900. Alfred University gave him the honorary doctorates of divinity (1881) and of laws (1901).

He was in his prime a strikingly handsome man, tall,

erect, with a smiling face, bright eyes, and patriarchal beard. His greeting was hearty and manner charming.

After the Secretary's report the report of the Committee on Nomination of Officers was made, and being accepted and adopted the following were declared the elected officers for 1909:

President: Francis Albert Christie

Vice-President: Arthur Cushman McGiffert

Treasurer: Barr Ferree

Secretary: Samuel Macauley Jackson

Councillors: Edward Tanjore Corwin and Henry Kalloch Rowe.

Attention being called to the celebration in the city of Geneva in July next of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Calvin, and in the city of Leipzig a little later in the same month of the five hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Leipzig, and it being announced that our associate Williston Walker would attend these functions, he was on motion chosen to represent this Society on these occasions.

No further business offering, with a vote of thanks to Columbia University for its hospitality in giving the Society a place of meeting, the Society then adjourned.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,

Secretary.

THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE REORGANIZED AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

THE Society met at ten o'clock in the morning of December 30, 1909, in Room 502 of Hamilton Hall, the building of Columbia University erected by the late John Stuart Kennedy. The session was held jointly with the American Historical Association's section on medieval history. Our representative in this meeting was Edward Waite Miller, and his theme was "The Church and Medieval Trades Unions." After this session those who had been in attendance from our Society had luncheon together in the restaurant connected with the University, known as The Commons.

The second session was held at 3 P.M., in Room 602 in Hamilton Hall and was by ourselves. The President delivered his address, which was a review of the literature in church history produced during 1909. The papers were by Edwin Knox Mitchell on "Early Christian Funeral and Burial Customs," and by Henry Elias Dosker on "The Early Dutch Anabaptists," read by William Walker Rockwell and the Secretary respectively, as the authors could not be present. The first of these papers can not be given in this volume as it will be elsewhere published.

At half-past six that evening we sat down together at the National Arts Club and after dinner continued the reading of papers and the transaction of such business as came before us. The papers were on "The Marian Exiles" by George Edwin Horr, and on "The Scenes of the Spanish Life of

Ignatius Loyola" by the Secretary. The second of these papers being in the nature of travel notes is omitted from this volume.

Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., showed the MS. of his "Source Book of Church History," which was in a forward state, and Williston Walker reported on the celebrations of the founding of the universities of Geneva and of Leipzig, both of which he had attended as our representative. Then came general business, the reports of Secretary and Treasurer, of the Committee on Bibliography, and election of officers.

Since our reorganization three years ago we have taken in seventy-five members, but death has robbed us of ten, namely, Alexander Viets Griswold Allen, Leonard Woolsey Bacon, John Benjamin Drury, George Anson Jackson, Gottlob Frederick Krotel, Henry Charles Lea, Abram Herbert Lewis, John Nicum, Hugh McDonald Scott, and Charles Comfort Tiffany. Our tribute will here be paid to those not already commemorated: see Vol. I., pp. xi-xvi.; and this volume, pp. 3-7.

GEORGE ANSON JACKSON died at Swampscott, Massachusetts, on Wednesday, May 8, 1907. He was born at North Adams, Massachusetts, Tuesday, March 17, 1846, and so did not quite complete sixty-one years of life. He was graduated from the scientific department of Yale College with the degree of bachelor of science in 1868, but did not pursue a scientific career; on the contrary, studied theology with the class of 1871 of Andover Theological Seminary and was graduated. He was pastor of the Congregational church of Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1871 till 1873, then was acting pastor of Globe Village, Massachusetts, from 1874 till 1878, when he removed to Swampscott, where he was acting pastor till 1880, and pastor till 1897, when he became librarian of the General Theological Library of Boston, and was in that position at his death. He wrote or prepared a number of volumes which display literary skill,

a practical mind, and unusual scholarship. The list is as follows: *The Christian Faith: A Manual for Catechumens*, Boston, 1875 (pp. 44); *New Creed Catechism*, 1885; *Infant Class Catechism*, pp. 23; *Teachers' Catechism*, pp. 24; *Pastors' Catechism*, pp. 64; *The Son of a Prophet* (a novel), 1893, pp. viii. + 394; *The Ladye Susan*, 1904, pp. 52. But chiefly his reputation rests on the little books upon the Fathers which were published under the general title of "Early Christian Literature Primers," edited by the late Professor G. P. Fisher and published by D. Appleton & Company of New York. They were probably of his own suggestion and were four in number: *The Apostolic Fathers, and the Apologists of the Second Century* (1879, pp. 203), *The Fathers of the Third Century* (1881, pp. 211), *The Post-Nicene Greek Fathers* (1883, pp. 224), *The Post-Nicene Latin Fathers* (1884, pp. 231). They are primers but they display unusual patristic and linguistic knowledge, for the selection of passages for translation is made with good judgment and the translations are apparently original. Consequently they constitute excellent source books for the periods they cover. But I fear the public did not buy them in sufficient quantities to make them lucrative to the publisher; at all events, the two additional series which Mr. Jackson planned, one in two volumes, one on the Medieval doctors and the other on the Medieval schoolmen and mystics, and carrying the readings down to the Reformation, and the concluding series, which was to be in twelve volumes, covering all periods since down to 1884, and concluding with eight papers by representative scholars of the Congregational, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Reformed, Baptist, Methodist, and Lutheran communions, were not published. Such volumes ought to be published, but then one cannot expect publishers to print all the good books upon which they are certain to lose money. They and authors lose enough money as it is.

JOHN BENJAMIN DRURY died of heart trouble in his

home in New Brunswick, New Jersey, on Sunday, March 21, 1909. Those of you who knew him will associate him with life, abundant life, rather than with death, for he had a merry laugh and a cheerful manner and seemed the embodiment of good health. As far as dates go, the story of his life is soon told. He was born at Rhinebeck on the Hudson, New York, on Wednesday, August 15, 1838. So his life did not extend quite to seventy-one years. His college training was received at Rutgers, and he was graduated with high honors in 1858. His theological training was given in the theological seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church at New Brunswick, New Jersey, where Rutgers College is, and thence he was graduated in 1861. His entire ministerial life was spent in the service of the Dutch Church. He was licensed by the Classis of Poughkeepsie, and was for the year 1861-2 supply of the mission church at Davenport, Iowa. Returning to New York State, he was from 1864 till 1887 pastor of the First Reformed Church of Ghent. He then left the pastorate and till his death was editor, lately editor-in-chief, of *The Christian Intelligencer*, the organ of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. His standing and attainments are attested by this and these further facts: that while a pastor he was given by his alma mater the degree of doctor of divinity in 1880; that he was Vedder lecturer at New Brunswick in 1883; was lecturer in the summer school of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy in 1885; president of the General Synod in 1886; and was delegate of his denomination at the meeting of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance in London, 1888; Toronto, 1892; Washington, 1899; and Liverpool, 1902. After becoming editor he had little time for other writing, but while in the pastorate he published an *Historical Sketch of the First Reformed Church of Ghent* (Chatham, N. Y., 1876); *Historical Sketch of the Reformed (Dutch) Church of Rhinebeck, N. Y.* (Chatham, N. Y., 1881), and his Vedder Lectures on *Truths and Untruths of Evolution* (New York, 1884). Dr.

Corwin, in his *Manual of the Reformed Church in America* (4th ed., pp. 435-6), gives him credit for quite a list of publications, but those here mentioned are the chief.

The next one to leave us was HUGH McDONALD SCOTT. This death was not due to disease but to an accident. He lived in Chicago, and on Thursday, April 29, 1909, was going to his home in that city when in some way on leaving the electric car in which he had been riding he was struck by another car on a parallel track, which was so close to the first track that a human being could not stand between them while cars were passing. It was not till the cars had passed one another that it was known that any one had been caught between them. He was then discovered in an unconscious and dying condition. Happily he was soon identified, but before his son could reach him he had died.

He was born at Guysborough, Nova Scotia, Friday, March 31, 1848; graduated at Dalhousie College, Halifax, 1870; then studied in Edinburgh, where he got the degree of B.D. in 1873. From 1874 till 1878 he was pastor of the Presbyterian church at Merigomish, Nova Scotia; for the next three years was a student in Germany, but from 1881 till his death a teacher, being professor of church history in the Chicago Congregational Theological Seminary. He was a contributor to periodicals, and for seven years, from 1883 till 1890, had charge of the church history department in the *Current Discussions in Theology*, the annual volume formerly published by the faculty of his seminary, but only one book stands to his credit, namely, the Stone Lectures delivered in Princeton Theological Seminary in 1896 on *The Nicene Theology*. He was a member of our old society, and expected to take part in this meeting, for he had long ago promised me a paper. I met him last at the Congregational Ecumenical Congress at Edinburgh in July, 1908. He was a genial man, with much tact and humor. His degree of Doctor of Divinity came to him from Beloit College in 1884.

But the third chronologically of our dead in 1909 was by far the most distinguished member of our Society, HENRY CHARLES LEA. This is not the time to enter into any extended notice of this wonderfully fruitful life. But a little must be said, for we all felt honored that his name was upon our roll.

Mr. Lea was born in Philadelphia on Monday, September 19, 1825, and died of pneumonia in the same city Sunday, October 24, 1909. He never went to college, but received his education in private. He was of Quaker ancestry, a lineal descendant of John Lea, who came to Philadelphia in 1699 in company of William Penn. His father was a partner of Mathew Carey in the publishing business, and into this house he entered in 1843, and on the retirement of his father in 1851 became its head. He retired himself in 1880. He inherited the tastes of his father for natural history, and his earliest writing was in that department. He also showed poetical gifts and published a volume of poetry. It seems strange now to mention these facts as his reputation with us rests upon quite different publications. As far back as 1857 he published in the "North American Review" a series of articles which he elaborated some years later into the familiar volume on *Superstition and Force* (1866, 4th ed., 1892). Henceforth he yielded himself to the fascination of that region of limitless research, the Middle Age, and to the phenomenon of the Western Church, and produced book after book of the most substantial character. He lived in a fine house in Philadelphia (2000 Walnut Street), accumulated a notable library, for which he built an annex, and every day divided his time between literary labor and the care of his large property. It was the latter which gave him ideal facilities for work. Unlike most of us whose sight, much more use, of rare volumes must be in public libraries, he had simply to buy these books and study them at his leisure. He was also spared the weariness of ransacking a library, note-book in hand, and of making excerpts

from almost illegible MSS., for all he had to do was to order transcripts to be made by experts on the spot. By this easy method, which is heartily to be commended, he got material from Spain and Italy, from France and Germany, from Mexico and South America. He then worked it up without haste, and without rest either. He was personally a social, democratic, public-spirited man, foremost in all reform movements in his native city and throughout the land, but in that library of his he lived in the atmosphere of controversy, outrage, deception, cruelty, and fraud, for his themes were superstition and violence, the disputed claims of sacerdotal celibacy, the controversy respecting indulgences, and the tortures of the Inquisition.

In this report it will not be necessary to give a catalogue of his publications. We are all more or less familiar with them. None of us has probably read all his books through, for they are not light reading by any means, which the publishers seem to recognize, for they have printed them on heavy paper and bound them in heavy bindings, as if these were appropriate. But we have consulted these books time and time again, and have been impressed with the importance of the theme, the wide scope and thoroughness of the research, and the patient labor which brought so many contributory rills into the mighty stream of learning. The object of his study is the Western branch of the Christian Church. He demonstrated its very mundane nature and tore the mask off from its frequent duplicity. But our Roman Catholic friends, while they could not convict him of misrepresentation, claimed that he was prejudiced and did not give the virtues, the helpful ministries, the visions of goodness, and the saintly lives of the Church due prominence. (See the Roman Catholic side stated in Paul Maria Baumgarten, *Die Werke von Henry Charles Lea und verwandte Bücher*, Münster 1908). He received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from the Universities of Pennsylvania, 1868, Harvard, 1890, and Princeton, 1896.

Rev. Prof. Dr. Adolph Spaeth has kindly contributed the following sketch of the last of our associates to leave us:

JOHN NICUM was born in 1851 at Winnenden, Wuerttemberg, from humble, but pious Christian parents. He came to America, about 1867, with no higher education than that of a good parish school of his native country. For some time he was an apprentice in a confectionery shop in Philadelphia. After confirmation he connected himself with St. Johannis German Lutheran Church and was active in the Sunday School. As he expressed a desire to enter the Foreign Mission field and to prepare himself at the Institute in Basel for such service, his pastor, Rev. A. Spaeth, suggested to him the ministry of the Gospel in this country and prepared him for entrance into Muehlenberg College, Allentown. From there he graduated in 1873 and entered the Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. He was ordained by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1876. After serving some mission-congregations in Pennsylvania, he was called in 1880 to St. John's German Lutheran Church in Syracuse, whence in 1887 he went to St. John's Church in Rochester, N. Y., and was its pastor at the time of his death. From 1894 till 1902, in addition to his pastorate, he was President of Wagner Memorial College, Rochester, N. Y., teaching also mental and moral science and Hebrew.

His literary activity extended over many years. Even as a college student in Allentown he assisted the Rev. S. K. Brobst in the publication of the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, afterwards: *Herold und Zeitschrift*. In 1884, he published a work on the *Laws of the State of New York in Relation to Churches*; in 1888, the *History of the New York Ministerium*; in 1889, *The Doctrinal Development in the New York Ministerium*; in 1891, a translation of the late Rev. Prof. Dr. E. J. Wolf's *Lutherans in America*, with valuable additions to the original; in 1909, *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church in the United States*. He contributed to Meusel's *Kirchliches Handlexicon*, and furnished a number

of articles for the *Lutheran Cyclopedia*. For a number of years he was German Secretary of the General Council. He died at Rochester, N. Y., Monday, November 1, 1909. He received the degree of Doctor in Divinity from Muhlenberg College in 1893.

During the three years of our reorganized life there has lived at our side, we might say, one who had done much work of high order in church history, and yet he was not in our company, nor even aware of our existence. On Monday, December 20th, in a sanitarium at Litchfield, Connecticut, he died. His name among men was GEORGE PARK FISHER. By this name we all knew him, and many of us knew him personally. He was by common consent given first place at our symposiums. To exchange even a few words with him was to feel better for the rest of the day. His winning smile, his cheery voice, his cordial grasp, his witty speech, these first impression-making facts brought you at once into the circle of his admirers. The volumes he wrote were all calculated to instruct and to uplift. He had insight into spiritual things and wrote with care and accuracy. He was eighty-two when upon his clarified vision there burst the heavenly world, and he was received into the triumphant division of that church whose militant division had been the object of his life-long studies.

The Treasurer's report showed that on December 28, 1908, there was a balance in bank to the Society's credit of \$16.65; that the receipts of the year were \$175.50, which made a total of \$192.15. The disbursements of the year were: for printing by The Knickerbocker Press, on February 23, \$7.50, and by The Red Diamond Press, on March 11, \$31.40; that there were bank charges for collecting checks, 60 cents, making a total of \$39.50, and leaving a balance on December 29, 1909, of \$152.65.

This report of the Treasurer was accepted and ordered on file.

The Committee on Nomination made this report:

For President: Arthur Cushman McGiffert.

For Vice-President: Edward Tanjore Corwin.

For Treasurer: Barr Ferree.

For Secretary: Samuel Macauley Jackson.

For Councillors: Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., and Henry Kalloch Rowe.

This report was adopted and the persons named therein were declared duly elected to their respective offices.

The Committee on Bibliography reported through Mr. Rockwell that the Library of Congress would extend its admirable system of card catalogues so as to include more religious periodicals, and as the resources of the Library were so much greater than those of such a Society as ours that our assistance in securing a fuller representation of such literature would be limited to suggestion of periodicals to index.

With a vote of thanks for the hospitality the Society had received from Columbia University, the Society then adjourned.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,

Secretary.

The following members registered themselves during the meetings: In 1908, Jacobs, Christie, Spaeth, Ewell, Walker, Ayer, Corwin, Carter, Johnson, Richards, Good, Weber, Faulkner, Ferree, Rockwell, Simpson, and Jackson. In 1909, Spaeth, Walker, Rockwell, Rowe, Miller, Christie, Severance, Ayer, Ewell, Horr, Faulkner, Corwin, and Jackson.

The Four Hundred and Four Theses of

Dr. John Eck

The Presidential Address

By

Henry Eyster Jacobs

THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FOUR THESES OF
DR. JOHN ECK, PUBLISHED IN 1530

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE AUGSBURG
CONFESSION

BY HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, DEAN OF THE EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PHILADELPHIA,
PENNSYLVANIA.

(The Presidential Address, Read December 29, 1908)

IN fulfilling the duty which you have assigned me, I have selected a topic pertaining to the history of the preparation of the earliest and fundamental Confession of Protestant Christianity, the Augsburg Confession. It is my purpose to estimate the influence, upon its final form, of a document which the Lutheran Reformers found in circulation on their arrival at Augsburg more than seven weeks before the Confession was presented by the Evangelical Princes to the Emperor Charles V.

On March 11, 1530, John, the Electoral Duke of Saxony, received at his residence in Torgau, an imperial citation, issued from Bologna, January 21st, and transmitted by the Imperial Chancellor from Spire, February 20th, summoning him to appear at Augsburg, April 8th. The announced purpose was to deliberate concerning war against the Turks and the religious dissensions that were disturbing the peace of the Empire. No time was lost. The very next day found the Electoral Council occupied with plans for the journey, the selection of those who were to be asked to accompany the Elector, and the providing of the funds necessary for what was to be an expensive undertaking.

The Saxon Chancellor, Dr. George Brück, gave a written opinion concerning topics to be considered, and, two days later, followed this by another, urging the importance of carrying with them to Augsburg a carefully elaborated memorandum concerning the religious questions involved, accompanied with scriptural arguments.

On the same day, May 14th, the Elector of Saxony wrote to Luther, Justin Jonas, Bugenhagen, and Melancthon, informing them of the summons which he had received, and enjoining them, forsaking all other duties, to apply themselves at once to the preparation of such a memorandum. In this letter, the topics to be comprised are restricted to those concerning which there had been dissensions. The design was to exhibit not the agreements, but the points of difference between those whom the Elector was to represent and the opponents of the Reformation. The correspondence shows very clearly that the Elector was feeling his way and wanted to be prepared for any emergency. For this purpose, he directed Luther, Jonas, and Melancthon to arrange for their absence from the University, Melancthon to accompany him to Augsburg, and Luther and Jonas as far on the way as circumstances might advise. They were informed also that other States summoned to the Diet would appoint representatives from their theologians to co-operate. "Since among the subjects to be discussed," he says, "one is with respect to the dissension concerning our Christian Religion, it is important that a statement or opinion be first discussed and determined among the States themselves," and this statement is to include "the matters both in faith and in outward Church ceremonies concerning which there is dissent." "In this way, before the Diet begins a decision may be reached as to how far we and the other States that have received the pure doctrine can with a good conscience endure prevalent abuses." The Wittenberg Theologians were instructed to complete their memorandum by May 20th, and to hand it on

that day to the Elector at Torgau. They at once gave all their time to the work committed to them, but it was April 3d before they came to the Elector at Torgau, just in time to leave with him next day for Augsburg. The result of their labors up to that time had been no finished document, but a collection of unequally elaborated notes on some points, indicating by mere catch-words matters that might be included.

There is a difference of opinion as to whether or not, with these notes, the Schwabach Articles of 1529 were not also included in the material provided for the Elector. A long delay occurred at Coburg, where Luther was left on April 23d, to remain until after the adjournment of the Diet. Here also the Elector received important suggestions as to the contents of the proposed document from a commissioner, Hans von Dolzig, whom he had sent for conference to the Count of Nassau. In his communication, the need of a positive doctrinal statement, beside an elaborate enumeration of abuses, is urged. The stay of a day at Nürnberg doubtless impressed upon them the importance of repudiating certain extremists from whom the churches there had recently suffered.

The Saxons had the honor of being the first participants in the Diet to reach Augsburg. They entered May 2d; the Emperor did not appear until June 15th. The interval gave time for perfecting their plans. Even before the arrival of the other Protestant Princes and representatives, Melancthon resumed the work that had been interrupted by the journey. The revision of the memorandum in accordance with the new conditions which he found at Augsburg, now occupied all his attention. The preparation of what he calls the "exordium," *i.e.* the doctrinal statements preceding the enumeration of abuses complained of, gave him at Augsburg the most concern. The advice of Luther at Coburg was repeatedly sought, and drafts sent to him for his criticism.

When the Saxons had arrived, May 2d, they found that, notwithstanding their early appearance, there was one who had anticipated the representatives of the various States, if not in person, nevertheless by his published attacks. The indefatigable opponent of Luther, Johann Meier von Eck, generally known as Dr. John Eck, Professor at Ingolstadt, once on friendly terms with Luther, but from the publication of the XCV. Theses, which he answered with his "Obelisks," regarding himself as the chief support of the Papacy in its struggle in Germany, was on the scene. He had prepared and published a pamphlet of thirty-four pages in small quarto, which the Protestants found in circulation at Augsburg, under the title:

"Under the Patronage of the Lord Jesus and Mary. Four Hundred and Four Articles; Some pertaining to the Disputations at Leipzig, Baden, and Berne; others drawn from the writings of those disturbing the peace of the Church; which John Eck, the very least minister of the Church, offers to discuss before the Emperor Charles V. and the Princes of the Empire, as is explained more at large in the program at Augsburg; on a day and hour to be hereafter published by consent of the Emperor."

It is an artfully constructed document, written in the most bitter controversial spirit, intended to impose on the credulity of those not well-informed, to excite prejudice, and to announce beforehand that no compromises with Lutheranism could be expected. It is chiefly a collection of statements of Luther and other Reformers either torn from their connection and misapplied, or falsely ascribed to them, no reference being made as to the places in which the statements were made. With the statements ascribed to Luther and his associates are others quoted from some whom Luther repudiated as energetically as did Eck, but for whose extravagances the Lutheran Reformers are made responsible. Erasmus wrote with much amusement concerning these Articles to Melancthon, that he found himself quoted, only

that Eck had concealed the name of Erasmus, and artfully ascribed the statement to "Quidam," "somebody."

The Articles begin with the Forty-one Propositions of the Bull of Leo. X. against Luther of Dec. 10th, 1520, followed by the Leipzig Theses of Eck against Luther and Carlstadt, and his Eleven Baden Theses against Zwingli and Œcolampadius. Then comes a list of 339 errors ascribed: 203 to Luther, 55 to Zwingli, 48 to Melancthon, 15 to Bucer, 9 to Œcolampadius, 4 to Bugenhagen, 4 to Osiander. Blaurer, Carlstadt, Pirkheimer, Capito, Rhegias, the Zwickau prophets, the Anabaptists, the Nürnberg preachers, are mingled in one undistinguishable mass, with four "somebodies," acknowledged by Erasmus as his own.

They are gathered under the headings, not arranged in strict logical order, as follows: "Against Christ," "The Holy Spirit," "The Sepulchre of Christ," "God," "The Cross of Christ," "Mary," "The Apostles," "St. Paul," "The Saints," "Relics," "The Council of Nice," "Noah," "The Limbus Patrum," "The O. T.," "The N. T.," "The Gospel," "Angels," "The Church," reaching finally "Sin," "Faith," "Works," "Merits," "Love," "The Sacraments," "Infants," "Confirmation," "The Eucharist," "Both Kinds," "Confession," "Repentance," "The Keys," "Satisfaction," "The Mass," "Canonical Hours," "Marriage," "Divorce," "Celibacy," "Vows," "Purgatory," etc.

The Archives at Munich show that Eck was not satisfied with printing and diffusing broadcast at Augsburg these propositions. There is preserved in that repository a letter addressed to the Emperor, a transcript of which has been published by Gustav Plitt in his "Einleitung in die Augustana" (i., 527), in which Eck sets forth, with still greater definiteness than in what he has printed, the purpose of the tract. The printed copy sent with this letter has certain propositions marked to which he desired the Emperor to give particular attention, and has added in writing occasional annotations.

This grandiloquent Latin letter, a translation of which we herewith submit, shows clearly that it is Eck's purpose to hold Luther either directly or indirectly responsible for all the errors contained in his list of heresies.

"Most Revered Emperor:

"By all Catholics, thou art esteemed as one who has been appointed, elected, and consecrated of God to come to the aid of the wavering catholic faith, to help the afflicted Church and oppressed churchmen, to maintain the Christian State against the sanguinary Turkish tyrant, the Sultan, and, in a word, to save the Christian world.

"But since Martin Luther, a domestic enemy of the Church, has not been improved by the former admonition of Thy Imperial Majesty, but having fallen into every Scylla and Charybdis of impiety, calls the Pope of Rome Antichrist; the Church a harlot; bishops, masques and idols; universities, synagogues of Satan; cloisters, brothels; theologians, bats; secular princes, fools, drunkards, insane, and worse than Turks; and meanwhile does not withhold himself from attacks also upon Thy Holy Majesty, but teaches the lordship of Christ and maligns and ridicules Thy Imperial mandates with the most obscene interpretations; and since, also, he has reached such an extremity of desperation, as a blasphemer of God, impious towards the saints and sacraments, irreverent, reproachful, and rebellious towards all superiors, ecclesiastical as well as secular, an enemy of all good men, that he praises none but heretics, extols schismatics, excites seditions in Germany, prepares for shedding a flood of Christian blood, and is collecting bands of Germans to bathe themselves in the blood of the Pope and his Cardinals, and is producing a generation of vipers still worse than himself—for to Luther we owe as his children the iconoclasts, sacramentarians, Capernaïtes, new Hussites and their progeny the Anabaptists, the new Epicureans who deny the immortality of the soul, and the spiritualists as

well as the new Corinthians who deny the divinity of Christ. Since also they are rending Germany with these monstrosities and portents, demolishing churches, overthrowing altars, treading under foot the most holy Eucharist, burning the images of Christ and the saints, abolishing divine worship, casting the images of saints into the rubbish heaps, raging against the gold and silver treasures of the Church, despoiling the revenues of churches and monasteries, voiding the last wills and testaments of the deceased, and, in short, attacking all things pertaining to the Christian religion even worse than Turks, so as by their persecutions and threats to induce virgins consecrated to God to abandon the cloisters; very many of them, amidst crimes so execrable, even dare to announce their readiness to defend themselves according to the Recess of the Diet of Spires, and to respond concerning these things to God and thy Most August Majesty, as though thou art a patron of their impieties, blasphemies, thefts, sacrileges, and seditions, pretending that the most holy Imperial Head of the world, and hoping that the supreme justice of the divine Emperor, would defend their supreme injustice. Notwithstanding the unlawfulness of agitating and discussing anew the things rightly judged and arranged by a Council, they excite ancient heresies condemned more than a thousand years ago, follow teachers who have been burned, and men of accursed memory, seducing simple people with the plea that they follow the Gospel, the Bible, the Word of God.

“I offer myself, therefore, to Thy Imperial Majesty, prepared, as at Leipzig against Luther, and at Baden against Œcolampadius, to repel their mendacious boasts, to defend all the institutions, practices, doctrines, and observances of the Catholic faith, and to attack their assailants. Let the Church's enemies, the ministers of ungodliness, the patrons of heresies, the vessels of iniquity, come forth and fulfil that whereof they so insolently boast to the people; let them answer concerning the faith before the Power which is of

God, the Member of God, the Church's Advocate, the faith's Protector. Farewell, Father of the country, Most August and Victorious Emperor. God protect and guide thee; grant thee victory over the Turk, and mercifully extend thy rule still farther.

"INGOLSTADT, March 14, 1530."

The second day after his arrival at Augsburg, Melanchthon informs Luther: "Eck has brought together a great heap of Conclusions. He asks the Princes to arrange for a discussion against the Lutherans." At the same time, he states that he is elaborating "the exordium" of the Confession beyond what had been intended on leaving Coburg. Under the same date, he writes to Veit Dietrich, Luther's companion at Coburg, of his purpose "to run over" within a few days and to bring with him for revision the draft of the Apology which he is writing. A week later, he gives Luther more details: "With this, I am sending you our Apology, or, more properly speaking, Confession. The Emperor has no time for extended discussions. Nevertheless I have said what seemed to be especially profitable or proper. For this purpose, I have embraced about all the articles of faith, because Eck has published against us the most diabolical slanders. Against these, I have decided to oppose a remedy."

The doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession are, therefore, Melanchthon's "remedy," as he says, against the διαβολικωτατας διαβολους of Eck. The self-restraint, the caution, the composure, the concentration of the Augsburg Confession, amidst the many inducements which Eck's Propositions furnished for extended and impassioned treatment, are certainly remarkable. They justify Melanchthon's claim: "Ego Apologiam paravi scriptum *summa verecundia*." The object is to meet the misrepresentations with which the mind of the Emperor was occupied, by brief, calm, objective statements, presenting in exact terms the positive teaching

of those attacked in Eck's propositions, and combining with this an equally clear and emphatic repudiation of errors and errorists with whom the Lutherans were confused. This declaration thus carefully drawn up by the theologians, when officially approved by the Protestant Princes and representatives of states, became a bond between them, and formal contract, by which they agreed with each other to stand or to fall. How critical the moment is shown by the intelligence that had reached Augsburg that the Emperor was hesitating between condemning them without a hearing, and listening to their case. The effect was to declare that, without arguing the justice or injustice of Eck's presentations, whether they were true or false, here is the declaration on the subjects involved, for which alone we are responsible.

The mode in which the Articles of the Augsburg Confession were formulated was by following the general outline of the Schwabach Articles, but greatly changing them in view of the changed conditions. "*Subinde enim mutandi sunt atque ad occasiones accommodandi*" (*Corpus Reformatorum*, ii., 60, Letter to Luther, May 22d).

In Article I., treating of God and the Trinity, regard has evidently been taken of Eck's Proposition 82, in which Luther is quoted as saying: "My soul hates the word 'homooousion,' *i.e.* the Father and Son of the same essence," and of Proposition 146, in which he is represented as repudiating the Council of Nice: "In the Holy Council of Nice, faith and the gospel were lacking, and human traditions gained the upper hand."

Hence the Article becomes: "Our churches, with common consent, do teach that the decree of the Council of Nice, concerning the Unity of the Divine Essence and the Three Persons, is true and to be believed without any doubting; that is to say, there is one Divine Essence which is called, and which is, God; and yet these Three Persons of the same essence (ὁμοουσιού) and power," etc.

This Article is more than a treatment of the doctrine concerning God. In the opening sentences, it places in the foreground the principle of the historical continuity of the Church, and declares the reverence with which those who made the Confession dealt, in all their critical work, with historical precedents. It separated them from the ultra-subjectivists who cared nothing for historical considerations.

The second Article of the Confession bears a similar relation to Propositions 184, 185, 186. In the former, Zwingli is referred to as declaring: "Original sin is no sin, but a natural defect like stammering." How nearly true this report concerning Zwingli's doctrine is, may be read in the *Ratio Fidei* which he sent to Augsburg, and in which his very words are: "Original Sin is not properly sin." But for this position, the Lutheran representatives at Augsburg were not responsible. Zwingli's view had been one of the subjects of controversy between him and Luther, and at Marburg he had temporarily accepted Luther's position. In order, therefore, to clear the position of those for whom they acted from all suspicions of sympathy with the Zwinglian view, Article II. was prepared. In so doing, account was taken also of the circumstances that Proposition 185 charged Melancthon himself with declaring that Scripture made no difference between Original and Actual Sin. The language of the Augsburg Confession became so explicit on this subject, that it repudiated Eck and his colleagues as forcibly as Zwingli, and is attacked on this account in the Roman Catholic Confutation of the Confession. The close of the article has in view the misrepresentations made concerning Infant Baptism in Propositions 227-233.

Article III. covers the ground included in Propositions 66-82, and 83 and 84, concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit, by a paraphrase of the Apostles' Creed, further defining some of its statements. The clause that Christ was "a

sacrifice not only for original guilt, but for all actual sins of men," answers explicitly the charge brought in Proposition 265, that "no satisfaction is required for sins except the death of Christ," by reaffirming and explaining it.

Article IV. is a thoroughly objective and scientifically-framed statement of the relation of faith to justification, as over against the one-sided and misleading citations of Propositions 187, 197, 205, 210.

In Article V., the purpose is to sharply distinguish the teaching of the Lutherans on the work of the Holy Spirit from that of the pure subjectivists of various schools with whom Eck habitually confounds them in his tract. The definition of the gospel incidentally given as the promise "that God, not for our own, but for Christ's sake, justifieth them that believe," corrects the statement of Proposition 166 in which Luther is quoted as declaring: "The gospel is nothing but preaching concerning the Resurrection of Christ."

Sixteen Propositions of Eck were occupied with various perversions of what those who dissented from Rome taught as to the relation of faith and works (Propositions 152-7, 187, 189, 191, 192, 194, 199-203, 367). We quote but three: 194. "Faith alone is necessary; all other things are most free, neither commanded, nor prohibited" (Luther). 367: "After one has been justified, no laws or ordinances bind him" (Melanchthon). 162: "The Gospel commands nothing whatever" (Melanchthon); "neither does it prohibit" (Luther).

These are answered by Article VI.: "Faith is bound to bring forth good works; and it is necessary to do the good works commanded by God."

The definition of the church in Articles VII. and VIII. corrects the inference of any approval of the statement ascribed to Bucer, following Augustine and Wiclif, that "only the predestinated are in the church; but the wicked or reprobate are not of the church" (170). "Although the church properly" says Article VIII. "is the congregation of

saints or true believers, nevertheless, since in this life many hypocrites and evil men are mingled therewith, it is lawful to use the sacraments which are administered by evil men in the church."

The seventeen Propositions of Eck (216-232) are disposed of in two brief sentences of Article IX.

The article concerning the Lord's Supper (XI.) was probably less influenced than any other by Eck's pamphlet. The aim of the Confession is simply to present the doctrine of a generic Real Presence, in order to disclaim responsibility for what was taught on the subject by those who presented the *Tetrapolitan* and the *Ratio Fidei* at the same time and place.

Article XI. is a direct answer to Propositions 255-258, concerning Confession and Absolution; Article XII., to 259-266, concerning Repentance, as well as to 190-193, concerning the inamissibility of grace; Article XIII., to 214-254, and 168, concerning the Sacraments in general; Article XIV., to 268, 269, concerning Ordination and the Universal Priesthood of Believers; and Article XV., to 300-332, 362-367, concerning Church Authority and Church Ordinances.

It was particularly with regard to the topics comprised in Article XVI., that the attempt was made to prejudice the Emperor and his advisers. Far more comprehensible to his mind and interesting were the statements concerning civil government than those concerning doctrine. Eck touched the Emperor's heart where it was most sensitive, and probably excited his intense indignation by appeals contained in citations like the following:

"334: We Christians are free, exempt from all the laws of men, liberated through baptism (Luther).

335: No laws can be imposed with any right upon Christians, whether by men or by angels, except so far as they themselves be willing (Luther).

336: Subjects neither can, nor will, nor ought to endure your tyranny any longer (Luther to the Princes).

339: I regret that I submitted to the Emperor at Worms. Whatever tolerance of my doctrine was conceded by my judges is of no account to tyrants (Luther).

340: There is no more excellent secular law than that of the Turk, as he has no canonical or civil law (Luther).

346: Ever since the beginning of the world, a wise Prince has been a most rare bird; for, generally, they are either the greatest fools or the very worst rascals; for they are God's policemen and executioners (Luther).

367: To impose law upon Christians, is to tempt the devil (Zwingli).

384: There is no hope of a remedy, unless all the laws of men having been once annulled, we judge and rule all things according to the gospel (Luther).

385: We must not take an oath with respect to temporal things; for he who requires an oath of another, or himself swears, must be of a malicious and trifling mind (Melanchthon).

387: All are heathen who contend in court for property or reputation (Luther).

389: It is a doctrine of devils that it is allowable for a Christian to wage war; for all who go to war are accursed children of Cain (Æcolampadius). To buy and sell are purely heathen matters (Luther).

390: Business contracts even for godly purposes are usurious (Strauss) or at least unjust (Luther).

391: A community of all things is commanded in the New Testament (Melanchthon).

403: It is proper and in accordance with God's word to excite seditions and tumults; hence there is no better proof that my doctrine is of God than that it excites discords, seditions, and tumults (Luther). Many of them, therefore, have often publicly testified to the common people: 'The gospel wants blood' (Zwingli).

404: Among Christians there should be no superiority,

no courts, nothing fenced up or closed, no 'meum' or 'tuum,' no restraint or excommunication (Anabaptists)."

The very phraseology of Article XVI. shows that it is an answer to these imputations of communism and anarchy:

"Of Civil Affairs, they teach that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God, and that it is right for Christians to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to determine matters by the Imperial and other existing laws, to award just punishments, to engage in just wars, to serve as soldiers, to make legal contracts, to hold property, to make oath when required by the magistrates, to marry, to be given in marriage.

"They condemn the Anabaptists who forbid these civil offices to Christians. They condemn also those who do not place faith in the perfection of the gospel, in the fear of God and in faith, but in forsaking civil offices, for the gospel teaches an eternal righteousness of heart. Meanwhile it does not destroy the State or the family, but especially requires their preservation as ordinances of God, and in such ordinances the exercise of charity. Therefore, Christians are necessarily bound to obey their own magistrates and laws, save only when commanded to sin."

The succeeding article is only an appendix to the sixteenth, repudiating the extravagances of the gross Chiliasts who taught that the time would come when the godly should take forcible possession of the earthly property of those not among their number.

Article XVIII., "On Free Will," is a direct and extended answer to Proposition 332: "It is under the tutelage of Satan that the term Free Will has arisen" (Luther).

In Article XIX., Melancthon repudiates the position which he had actually maintained in the first edition of his *Loci Communes*, (1521), and which Eck compelled him to face in Proposition 82, that "all things are done by God, both good and evil," to which Eck had appended the note, "*i.e.* God wills sin." The last two doctrinal articles XX.

and XXI., belong to the material for which provision was made in the Torgau Articles, and by an afterthought were transferred from the second to the first section of the Confession. Article XXI., however, directly meets the points made in Propositions 112-127.

The influence of Eck's tract may be traced also in the Articles on Abuses, although not to the same extent as in the Doctrinal Articles. In the latter, the Confession is no longer on the defensive, but is aggressive.

Compare, however, Article XXII. with Propositions 251-254, and 245, 296; XXIII. with Propositions 283, 295-299, and 304; XXIV. with Propositions 274-278; XXV. as on Article XI; XXVI. with Propositions 362-367; XXVII. with Propositions 300-320.

The well-known passage in the final article concerning the relation of the Lord's Day to the Sabbath, seems to have been elicited by Propositions 178-180.

Eck's Propositions influenced not only the material of the Confession, but in some parts even the order in which the subjects are treated. The organism of the Confession has greatly troubled some critics, but it is not as confused as it appears. Bearing in mind the fact that the Articles on Abuses were intended as the chief part, and the Doctrinal Articles were only introductory, the order of the latter is logical.

I. Theology.

II. Anthropology.

III. Christology.

IV-VI. Soteriology.

VII-XVI. Ecclesiology.

XVII. Eschatology.

XVIII-XXI. Answer to various objections and criticisms.

It is in the part treating of Ecclesiology that the influence of Eck's Propositions on the order can be traced. Article XI. on "Confession and Absolution," and XII. on

"Repentance," appear between the articles concerning the Lord's Supper and the use of the Sacraments in general, because these two articles, from the standpoint of the Roman Church, belong to the discussion of the Sacraments, and are so treated in Eck's paper.

This paper of Eck, as time has passed, has almost entirely been lost sight of. It was so thoroughly answered that its influence survives only in the suggestions which it made for the elaboration of the confession. It was as ephemeral as the issues of the daily press of to-day, to which, however, historians will turn hereafter to trace influences upon permanent legislation, or upon movements of far-reaching importance.

The use made by the Reformers of Eck's paper also illustrates the conception which the Confessors at Augsburg had of their work. They were responding to a particular call. They were meeting a particular emergency, and confined their attention to the issues of that particular hour. "Only those things have been recounted," they say as they close, "whereof we thought it was necessary to speak, so that it might be understood that, in doctrine and ceremonies, nothing has been revived on our part, against Scripture or the Church Catholic."

As to the question of limiting the testimony of the churches they represent to what is embraced in the Confession, they speak very plainly in the very last sentence: "If anything further be desired, we are ready, God willing, to present ample information according to the Scriptures."

 TEXT OF THE 404 THESES OF ECK

The title of the book here translated from the rare copy in the library of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, is as follows:

SUB DOMINI

IHESV ET MARIAE PATROCINIO.

Articulos 404 partim ad disputationes Lipsicam, Badeñ, & Berneñ attinentes, partim vero ex scriptis pacem ecclesiae perturbantium extractos, Coram diuo Cæsare Carolo V. Ro. Imp. semper Augu. etc., ac proin-
ceribus Imperii, Ioan. Eckius minimus
ecclesiae minister, offert se disputatu-
rum, vt in scheda latius explicatur
Augustae Vindelicorum.

Die	& hora	consensus	Cæsaris
	posterius	publicandis.	

The translation of this title page is as this:

Under the patronage of the Lord Jesus and Mary. Four hundred and four Articles; some pertaining to the disputations at Leipzig, Baden, and Bern, others drawn from the writings of those disturbing the peace of the church; which John Eck, the very least minister of the church, offers to discuss before the Emperor Charles V. and the Princes of the Empire, as is explained more at large in the Program at Augsburg; on a day and hour to be hereafter published by consent of the Emperor.

The translation of the book is as follows:

Inasmuch as for a number of years false prophets have been rising up and attempting to tear away the people from the unity of the Catholic Faith, corrupting all Ger-

many with errors, impieties, and blasphemies, so that what was formerly regarded most Christian has now become the cesspool of all errors, in behalf of the faith and for the Church I have hastily gathered these few out of their infinite errors. And since the enemies of the faith are making a parade of their writings and are offering in secret to dispute concerning them before the people, I offer, according to the judgment and disposition of our Most Glorious Prince and Lord, Charles V., perpetual Emperor of Spain, Germany, Sicily, a Catholic King, and our most clement Master, and of that of all the Princes of the Roman Empire, especially of our Most Serene Prince and Lord, Ferdinand, King of Hungary and Bavaria, and Archduke of Austria, and of our Most Illustrious Princes of the renowned House of Bavaria, to discuss in public the points below noted against any assailant of the Catholic truth; so as to establish our dogmas and overthrow the false dogmas of the adversaries, to the praise of God, the increase of faith and the strengthening of the weak.

TO GOD ALONE THE GLORY

While in order that Thy Holy Majesty and the Christian world may see and judge the impieties of the adversaries, I have gathered a very few out of their infinite errors, nevertheless I have guarded them from head to foot with my assertions, and offer to reply as to all in behalf of the faith and the Church.

ASSERTION OF ECK

I assert with entire confidence given by the Holy Spirit that the Articles of Luther concerning this shameful matter condemned by Pope Leo X. were legitimately condemned as heretical, erroneous, and scandalous. I anathematize and condemn them, and freely declare that they who agree with the Bull are Christian men, but that they who oppose

it are enemies of the faith, who ought to be regarded as heathen and publicans. Hence we introduce here all these XLI. Articles, ready to receive the attacks of any opponent, and to take the part of the Church.

I. It is an heretical but a usual statement, that the Sacraments of the New Testament give justifying grace to those who interpose no obstacle.

II. To deny that sin remains in a child after baptism, is to treat both Paul and Christ with contempt.

III. The tinder of sin, even though no actual sin be present, excludes a soul leaving the body from entrance into heaven.

IV. The imperfect love of a dying person necessarily carries with it great fear, which is alone sufficient to produce the punishment of purgatory, and prevents entrance into the kingdom.

V. There is no foundation in Holy Scripture or in the ancient Christian teachers for the doctrine that there are three parts of penitence, viz., contrition, confession, and satisfaction.

VI. One is made a hypocrite, aye, a great sinner, by contrition arising from self-examination, and reflection upon and detestation of sins, whereby, in the bitterness of his soul, one reviews his years, by considering the gravity of his sins, their multitude and heinousness, the loss of eternal blessedness, and the penalty of eternal condemnation.

VII. Most true is the proverb, and preferable to the doctrine of all hitherto taught concerning contrition, that not to do [penance] is the highest penitence, and a new life the best penitence.

VIII. Presume in no way to confess venial, or even mortal sins, because it is impossible to know all mortal sins; hence in the primitive Church only manifest mortal sins were confessed.

IX. In wishing to confess all things absolutely, we only show our unwillingness to leave anything for the mercy of God to forgive.

X. No sins are forgiven, unless when the priest forgives, the person believes that they are forgiven him; aye, sin would remain unless he would believe that it is forgiven; for the remission of sins and the bestowal of grace are insufficient, but one must believe that sin is forgiven.

XI. Trust in no way that you are absolved because of your contrition, but because of the word of Christ: "Whatsoever ye shall loose," etc. So I say, trust, if you have obtained absolution of a priest, and believe firmly that you have been absolved; and without regard to contrition, you will be truly absolved.

XII. If it were possible for a person not contrite to confess, or for a priest to absolve not seriously, but in jest, and if one should, nevertheless, believe that he were absolved, he would be absolved.

XIII. In the sacrament of penance, or remission of guilt, the Pope or Bishop does no more than the lowest priest; aye, when there is no priest, any Christian, even a woman or a boy, would do equally well.

XIV. No one should answer the priest that he is contrite, neither should the priest ask it of any one.

XV. Great is the error of those who come to the sacrament of the Eucharist, relying upon the fact that they have confessed; that they are not conscious of any mortal sins; that they have said their prayers and made their preparations. All these eat and drink judgment to themselves: but if they believe and trust that they will receive grace, this faith alone makes them pure and worthy.

XVI. It would be well for the Church, in a general council, to resolve that the laity should commune under both forms; and the Bohemians communing under both forms, are not heretics, but schismatics.

XVII. The treasures of the Church, from which the Pope gives indulgences, are not the merits of Christ and the saints.

XVIII. Indulgences are pious frauds upon believers, and hindrances to good works, and belong to the number of those things that are lawful, and not to the number of those that are expedient.

XIX. Indulgences do not avail, where truly received, to remit the punishment which eternal justice demands for actual sins.

XX. They are deceived who believe that indulgences bring salvation, and a spiritual benefit.

XXI. Indulgences are necessary only for public crimes, and are granted properly only to the hardened and impatient.

XXII. For six classes of men indulgences are not necessary or useful: viz., the dead, or dying, the sick, those hindered for sufficient reasons, those who have not committed crimes, those who have committed crimes, but such as are not public, and those who have reformed.

XXIII. Excommunications are only outward punishments, and do not deprive a man of the common spiritual prayers of the Church.

XXIV. Christians should be taught to love rather than fear excommunication.

XXV. The Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter, is not the vicar of Christ, appointed by Christ himself in St. Peter's, over all the churches of the world.

XXVI. The word of Christ to Peter: "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth," extends only to those things which Peter himself has bound.

XXVII. It is certain that it is within the power neither of the Church nor of the Pope to frame articles of faith or commands concerning morals and good works.

XXVIII. Even though the Pope, with the great part of the Church, should think so and so, and in thus doing should not err, it is still not a sin or heresy to think the contrary, especially in a matter unnecessary for salvation, until the one were rejected and the other approved by a General Council.

XXIX. We have the liberty (lit.: "the way has been opened to us") to state the authority of Councils, and freely contradict their doings and judge their decrees, and confidently confess whatever seems true, whether it have been approved or rejected by any Council.

XXX. Some articles of John Huss condemned in the Council of Constance are most Christian, true, and evangelical, and cannot be condemned by the Universal Church.

XXXI. In every good work, the righteous man sins.

XXXII. A good work done in the best way is a venial sin.

XXXIII. To burn heretics is against the will of the Spirit.

XXXIV. To war against the Turk is to resist God visiting our iniquities upon us through them.

XXXV. No one is sure that he is not always mortally sinning because of the most secret vice of pride.

XXXVI. Free will after sin is a thing with the title alone, and in doing what belongs to it, sins mortally.

XXXVII. Purgatory cannot be proved from the canonical scriptures.

XXXVIII. Souls in purgatory are not secure with respect to their salvation, at least not all; neither can it be proved either by reason or Scripture, that they are beyond meriting or increasing love.

XXXIX. Souls in purgatory sin without intermission, as long as they seek rest and dread punishments.

XL. Souls delivered from purgatory by the intercessions of the living, have less happiness than if they had made satisfaction of themselves.

XLI. Ecclesiastical prelates and secular princes would do no wrong if they were to entirely suppress all the mendicant orders.

ECK

So horrible are these Articles that even Luther, their author, repudiates some, and is unwilling to acknowledge them, and lies when he says that they have been falsely attributed to him. Such are nos. 26, 29, and 41. But there is an old proverb: "One ought to be mindful of a lie"; for, no. 26 he wrote in *De Resolutione Indulgentiarum*, Conclusio V., no. 29, in the "resolutio" of the Leipzig Disputation, immediately after the beginning, and no. 41, in a popular sermon on "Usury."

I, likewise, undertake to defend the positions invincibly defended by me for nineteen days against Luther and Carlstadt. If either they or their adherents will undertake to present anything new against these positions, I will abundantly satisfy them.

CONCLUSIONS OF ECK AT LEIPZIG

42. It is in accordance neither with the declarations of

Holy Scripture nor the Holy Fathers, Augustine and others, that our Lord and Master JESUS Christ, when he said: "Repent ye," meant that the entire life of believers should be repentance, and that, therefore, this word could not be understood of sacramental penitence.

43. We deny that even if there are daily venial sins, nevertheless that the righteous sins in every good work, even in a holy death. Likewise we say that it is erroneous to say that a righteous one can sin mortally while his righteousness remain, or that after baptism administered at the will of another the child retains sin.

44. One declaring in addition that repentance does not properly begin with hatred of sins by reflecting on the gravity of the sin and the punishment, and that this makes one still more of a sinner, a statement contrary to the Gospel and the Holy Fathers, we affirm should not be heard.

45. To say that God, in remitting guilt, remits punishment, and does not change it, by means of the Canons, and the injunction of the priest declared either entirely or in part, into a temporal satisfactory punishment, we think contrary to Holy Scripture and the usage of the Church.

46. That any priest, to say no prelate, can or ought to remit punishment and guilt to his parishioner seeking it, so that a prelate not fully absolving from guilt and punishment sins, we do not receive, since it is contrary to the Holy Scripture and the use of the Church.

47. That souls in purgatory make no satisfaction for the punishments of sins from whose guilt they have been here absolved, but for which they have not made satisfaction, we account erroneous, just as it is not without error that God requires of one about to die no other punishment than that of death.

48. He errs who, from the fact that man is actively disposed to evil, and only passively to good, denies that man's free will is master of his acts; just as he is not without error who contrary to the Scholastics, thinks that faith can

be corrupted by any crime; neither is he without the greatest error, who without any regard to contrition boldly asserts that one is absolved by faith alone.

49. Since it is contrary to truth and reason, we do not receive the teaching that from the imperfection of love or faith in the soul of the dead, horror and as it were despair results, with which souls in purgatory are affected, and that they incur this horror from the fear of death, and as it were die unwillingly.

50. That souls in purgatory merit greater grace, or that, if freed by the merits of others, their rewards are diminished, or that they are not certain of their salvation, or do not wish our prayers, we deny as contrary to our faith and all reason.

51. Since it is contrary to the truth and the Apostolical decrees, and as we regard keys the most imperishable treasure of the Church, we deny the assertion that the merit of the passion of Christ is not the treasure of the Church, from which indulgences are given. We also piously believe that we are aided by the merits of the saints.

52. To say that indulgences do not free is an error; to say further that indulgences are vicious, and thus that one thereby incurs greater guilt, is the very worst error. Hence we hold that he also errs who says that he is bound to condemn indulgences because the Lord says: "On account of myself, and not on account of money, I blot out iniquities."

53. That the Pope cannot through indulgences remit a punishment due on account of sin, is an error. Yea, it is erroneous that he cannot absolve from punishment souls existing in purgatory. Moreover what we repudiate most of all is that those about to die, weak, lawfully impeded, without public crimes, need no indulgences.

54. That the Church of Rome was not superior to other churches prior to the time of Sylvester we deny. But we have always acknowledged him who has the chair and faith

of Peter, as the successor of Peter and general Vicar of Christ.

Luther was subject to the decision of the Faculty of Paris, to whom he appealed before the Legate of the Apostolic Chair. Convicted by their opinion, he has defied them with his reproaches.

The Conclusions, moreover, which I undertook to defend before the twelve Cantons of the Swiss in opposition to Zwingli, Œcolampadius, and their followers I do not decline to maintain, if Zwingli in his exile should betake himself to Rottenacker.

CONCLUSIONS OF ECK IN BADEN

55. That the true body of Christ and his blood are present in the sacrament of the Altar.

56. They are truly offered in the Office of the Mass for the living and the dead.

57. We ought to invoke Mary and the Saints as intercessors.

58. Images of the Crucifix and the Saints are not to be destroyed.

59. After this life, there is a purgatorial fire.

60. Infants of Christians are born in original sin.

61. The baptism of Christ, not that of John, removes original sin.

Besides these all other things that Zwingli undertakes to attack in our true and indubitable faith.

ECK

With a black mark I noted very many godless things of Zwingli. Even the mad author was shocked when he saw them. Such was the following: The frequent making of the sign of the Cross terrifies the soul not otherwise than the characters of necromancers terrify the uninformed if they

be admitted to them. For this reason, he thinks that the sign of the Cross ought to be suppressed in the Mass in the sacramental action. To the Swiss he writes that this was invented by me against him, but that I said the truth is evident to one reading his Epichiresis concerning the Canon of the Mass, p. 221, p. 2.

Zwingli, seeing that his sect had attained much esteem from the disputation at Baden, provided that a disputation should occur at Bern. I refuted his acts with solid writings, and there was no one who responded. But, since I now offer myself prepared to defend before the Emperor and other Princes, contrary Conclusions for the faith and the truth, I propose them as follows:

62. Our Lord Jesus Christ, when about to leave the world, both of himself and by the Holy Spirit appointed prelates in the Church, as his Vicars, having the power of rule, and who are both said to be and are the Heads of the Church. He who is rashly rebellious to them, departs from Christ and the Church.

63. The Church of Christ and those presiding in it, make constitutions and enactments to the glory of God and the reformation of the faithful. If these things be not found in proper form in Holy Scripture, they are nevertheless obligatory in the forum of conscience; so that he who despises these, despises Christ.

64. Christ our Saviour is our Redeemer and righteousness, of whose passion and merit we ought to make ourselves partakers through the sacraments and good works. But if one idly thinks that he is saved in the Church without good works and satisfaction, he presumes and sins against the Holy Ghost.

Concerning the truth of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, concerning the sacrifice of the Mass, concerning purgatory and the intercession of saints, against the Bernese I affirm anew and constantly declare my five first Conclusions defended at Baden.

65. To say that marriage is commanded in every estate, even the sacerdotal, for the purpose of avoiding fornication, is the doctrine of Asmodeus; although he treads Christ still more grievously under foot, and exposes the Christian faith to ridicule throughout the whole world, who thinks that it is the chief virtue of a bishop to have a wife.

In addition to the above mentioned selections of innumerable errors and injurious writings and seditious aberrations, we will note a few more the contrary to which we will defend in behalf of the faith, the Church and the Christian Empire.

NEW AND OLD ERRORS NOW STIRRED UP

Concerning Christ:

66. Christ experienced terrors of soul even to despair (Bugenhausen).

67. Christ in despair cried out, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me (Premonstratenses, at Magdeburg).

68. The greatest cause of the fear of Christ was the sense of desertion and of divine wrath, by which Christ wavered between hell and life. In this fear, there was a desolation of the divine gifts in Christ; for in this affliction and anguish, there was a despoliation of love, because the divinity withdrawing itself, love did not glow (Melanchthon).

69. After the death of Christ, his soul ought to suffer in hell, and in martyrdom be attacked by demons (Antoni Zimmerman).

70. Christ complained that he was deserted of God, *i.e.*, that he was bereft of life and blessedness and all good (*ib*).

71. Christ is finite according to his humanity; therefore, he truly grew in wisdom and grace (Zwingli).

72. Christ as a man, is the adoptive Son of God (Bugenhausen).

73. Christ merited nothing for himself, but for us (Luther).

74. Christ rose not from a closed sepulchre, neither did he enter into the company of his disciples, while the doors were shut (Bucer).

75. Christ is not Head of the Church according to his human nature (Haller).

76. Christ no longer prays to God for us (Zwingli).

77. Christ did not appear personally to St. Paul, but only through angels (Zwingli).

78. In Christ, the two natures, human and divine, are mixed (Burguer de f. Gallo).

79. Christ did not have an intellectual soul, but in place of his soul had divinity (Luther).

80. Christ Jesus, according to his divine nature, is, properly speaking, the essence of all things (Zwingli).

81. The humanity of Christ is not to be adored; hence, the Eucharist is not to be adored (Zwingli).

82. My soul hates the word "homooousion," *i.e.*, the Father and the Son are of the same essence (Luther).

Against the Holy Spirit:

83. Since the death of Christ, the Holy Spirit is his Vicar (Bucer).

84. Reason pretends to give Christ honor by reflecting and meditating upon his death, but this is nothing to Christ (Melanchthon).

Against the Sepulchre of Christ:

85. The sepulchre of Christ's body, which the Saracens hold is no more a matter of care to God, than, according to the teaching of Paul, oxen are (Luther).

Against God:

86. The opinion is certain that all things are done by God, both good and evil, not only permissively but properly, as the adultery of David, etc. Accordingly the betrayal

of Judas no less than the call of Paul is His proper work (Melanchthon), *i.e.*, God wills sins.

87. God wanted himself regarded foolish by means of folly; a spiritual man by means of folly recognizes God as foolish (Melanchthon).

Against the Cross of Christ:

88. It would be much better were the Cross lost than found, humbled than exalted (Luther). And it is an abuse for churches to be built and founded in honor of the wood, upon which God hung.

89. It is a silly play and an idolatrous error to inclose a portion of the Cross in gold, carry it about the church, and offer it to the people to be kissed; hence were I to own a portion of the Cross, I would burn it to ashes (Luther). In the world there are so many pieces of the wood of the Cross, that a house could be built out of them. Would that no crown of thorns, yea, no holy cross had ever come to light (*ib*).

90. It was a singular and horrible festival that was instituted in honor of the tunic of Christ at Treves.

Against Mary:

91. Christ said to Mary: "What have I to do with thee!" meaning: Because you are a woman you think that some special favor will be shown you by me on the ground of a merit of prerogative. Understand, however, that you have no more influence with me than the woman who was a sinner, or the Syrophenician (Melanchthon).

92. Christ permitted Mary to err (Luther). And Joseph wanted to desert her under the suspicion of adultery (*ib*).

93. When Christ preached, the centurion had greater faith than Mary; for while Christ gave his mother great faith at the conception and nativity, afterwards it was not,

or only rarely, so great, and meanwhile he permitted it to waver (Luther).

94. The contradictory of the statement that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without original sin has not been censured (Luther.)

95. We certainly are just as holy as Mary (Luther). On this account, we are unwilling to have her as an advocate.

96. That on the day of the nativity of Mary we use the Epistle concerning the wisdom of God, and the Gospel concerning the nativity of Christ, is a falsehood and blasphemy (Luther, the Nurembergers).

97. The "salve regina," "regina cœli" are improper, and do a wrong to Christ, since they ascribe to a creature what belongs to God (Heathen; the Nurembergers; Luther).

98. Thy prayer, says Luther, is just as precious as that of Mary, because thou canst aid me just as much as she.

99. Christ was unwilling to comply with the curiosity of Mary, when she asked for a miracle when the wine failed (Zwingli).

100. *Claustra virginitatis Mariæ in partu fuerunt aperta et dimota* (Luther.)

101. I hate no festival more than that of the Conception of Mary, and that of Corpus Christi (Luther).

Against the Apostles:

102. The Council of the Apostles erred in commanding those converted from the Gentiles to abstain from blood and from what was strangled, and, accordingly they were corrected by Paul to the Colossians: "Let no man judge you, etc."

103. In the time of the Apostles the Gospel was not preached as clearly and purely as by me (Luther). Hence I was one whom they call Elias, Daniel, and a Man of God.

104. The Apostles were not believers when they were baptized. For this reason, Christ willed that the Apostles

should first baptize men, and then teach what should be done and left undone (Nuremberg preachers).

Against St. Paul:

105. Paul wanted to be damned for his brethren (Melanchthon). So Moses was willing to be led to the devil and to be condemned in soul and body for the people (Luther).

106. Many, with much probability, have asserted that this epistle was not written by the apostle James, and that it is not worthy of an apostolic spirit (Luther).

Against the Gospels:

107. The Evangelists wrote contradictions. This is so evident in many passages, that they cannot be harmonized. Moreover we believe that all the Apostles could err (Brunsfels).

108. The opinion ought to be abrogated that there are only four Gospels and four Evangelists (*ib*).

109. We are compelled to assert that there is no Scripture that can be proved to be such, except the Old Testament (*ib*).

110. Unless the Apostles had explained the Gospel in their writings, we would have nothing but trifles, and stupid and lifeless narration. To the Apostles, Peter, Paul, James, and John, and not to the Evangelists, is due the credit of handing down whatever we have that is pure with respect to the use and form of the Gospel (*ib*).

111. The New Testament has lost its power as well as the Old. Accordingly, we are to adhere to no Scripture, but only to the Spirit, according to the Eternal Gospel (fanatics and certain persons at Zwickau according to Emser.)

Against the Saints:

112. That those worshipping the Saints for temporal advantages, are little better than those who for money make a covenant with the devil (Luther).

113. Prayers to the Saints for avoiding any temporal evil are to be shunned, since they cannot aid us (Melanchthon).

114. Only through Christ, do we have access to God; accordingly confidence in the Saints falls (Luther).

115. Christ alone and not the Saints has been given as an example of a holy life (Zwingli).

116. The worship of Saints has reached such a pass that it were better that there were no festivals of Saints, and that their names were unknown (Luther).

117. The resorting of men to the churches of Saints is a work of the devil (Luther).

118. God cannot suffer that any one should say: St. Peter is my Apostle (Luther).

119. One cannot tell whether it be St. James or a dead dog or horse that is buried at Compostella or Toulouse (Luther).

120. The first Christopher who is portrayed as such was not a Saint. A ridiculous story! Every learned man laughs (Pillicanus).

121. Everything is a matter of suspicion that the church of priests reads to-day concerning Christopher, and not concerning this alone but also concerning two others, Gregory and Margaret (Pillicanus).

Against the Saints:

122. The Saints are to be honored more on account of their doctrine than on account of their life (Luther).

123. Since the ascension of Christ no one has gone to heaven or will go until the end of the world (Luther).

124. I have the same access to Christ as Peter and Paul (Luther).

125. Great idolatry has resulted from the worship of Saints (Luther, Zileysen, Glaib, Stifelin).

126. I would not give a farthing for the merits of St. Peter, so far as aiding me is concerned. He cannot help him-

self. Any beggar will be more useful to me than St. Peter, for what can St. Peter have more than you and I? (Luther).

127. The names of the Saints ought not to be placed in the Canon of the Mass, but only devils, since they are also devils (Luther). He also calls the Church of All Saints, the church of devils; and St. Benno he calls the devil of Meissen.

Against Relics:

128. The Relics of the Saints are nothing but an imposition on the people; on this account, they should be entirely buried in the ground (Luther).

129. The Blessed are not members of the Body of Christ. (Zwingli).

Against Miracles:

130. Miracles do not prove that Saints are to be invoked; the devil assumes masks (Æcolampadius, Zwingli).

131. Miracles have not been given to confirm faith (Zwingli).

Against Jerome:

132. The Commentaries of Jerome and Origen are mere trifles and foolishness, if compared with those of Melanchthon. They teach their own rather than Pauline and Christian doctrine; but Melanchthon is next to Paul (Luther).

133. Jerome superstitiously extols virginity in opposition to Jovinian. There are in Jerome many such things, superstitious rather than godly (Melanchthon).

134. Jerome did not write in a proper way against Jovinian. He seeks to prevail by assertion rather than by erudition. He also does violence to passages of Scripture, not to say corrupts them. Who knows whether Jerome may not have been one of those of whom it is said in

Ezekiel that when a prophet have erred and spoken a falsehood, "I the Lord have deceived that prophet!" (Luther).

135. If a book of Vigilantius were extant concerning the Relics of Saints, as there is one of Jerome, I think that the former would have written in a far more Christian way than the latter (Luther). For he is a singular, immodest, vain caviller (Zwingli).

136. Books should be edited by Christians having the sense of Christ. It is on account of this defect that many interpreters of Scripture, even Jerome, have erred in many passages (Luther). Holy Scripture does not admit of several meanings, as they dream of a literal, an allegorical, etc. But there is one most simple meaning of Scripture (Luther).

Against Gregory:

137. Jerome and Gregory erred when they took from us the right to judge concerning every doctrine (Luther).

138. Jerome erred when he forbade circumcision (Melanchthon). And he is a hundred thousand miles off from the opinion of St. Paul (Luther).

Against Augustine:

139. Augustine thinks that man is the image of God, because there are in the soul intelligence, memory, and will; but this figment has been fabricated not only without the authority of Holy Scripture, but even without reason.

Against St. Thomas:

140. A dove is painted at the ear of St. Thomas; I think it should have been a young devil in order that he might be adored (Luther).

Against St. Franciscus:

141. St. Franciscus erred stupidly and fell, and included himself and his brethren in his poverty; and thus drew the

Gospel from without into temporal poverty, against Christ (Luther).

Against Bernard:

142. Bernard, Franciscus, Dominic remained in great errors with the godless; for in their ignorance, they worshipped the Pope, believing that all that pertains to him is of God and right, which is directly contrary to the Gospel (Luther).

143. Franciscus, in founding his order, erred as a man. What if all the Fathers erred when they made vows? (Luther). For it was with a pious error that they fell when they vowed; and God tolerated their folly in his elect (Luther).

Against Benedict:

144. Benedict boasts with impious hypocrisy and perverse emulation of men (Luther).

Against the Council of Nice:

145. In the Council of Nice certain forms of penance were appointed. I do not declare in what spirit the decree was made by the Fathers. A good part of the Gospel, I see, yea, the true sense of the Gospel was obscured by this tradition (Melanchthon).

146. In the Holy Council of Nice, faith and the Gospel were lacking, and human traditions gained the upper hand (Luther).

Against Noah:

147. Although Noah was subject to judgment, and hearing the Word of God and sentence of condemnation would be judged, nevertheless he was taken away by the mercy of God (*ib*).

148. Noah's flood is the same as that concerning which the heathen have written as the flood of Deucalion (Zwingli).

Against the Limbus Patrum:

149. Christ descended ad inferos, non to a limbus patrum, a term unknown in Holy Scripture, but truly to hell, in order to see all places full of despair. On this account Christ praises God, that He has freed him from the hell, in whose chains he would have been eternally lost, lowest unless the hand of the Lord had been present (Bugenhagen).

150. That the Fathers in the Old Testament descended to hell is fictitious (Haller).

151. Abraham's Bosom is nothing but the Word of God (Luther).

Against the Old Testament:

152. I wish the Mosaic Law to be regarded as belonging to foolish and Gentile laws (*i.e.*, as Civil Law) (Melanchthon).

153. The part of the Law which has the Decalogue or Moral Precepts, has been antiquated in the New Testament (Melanchthon). Of the Decalogue, Luther makes eight and Zwingli eleven commandments.

154. The Old Testament may be observed or omitted to-day. Hence Jerome erred asserting that it was abrogated (Luther).

155. They do not sin who are circumcised, or who omit circumcision (Melanchthon).

156. Christ, by his death, confirmed the Old Testament (Melanchthon).

157. The reason why the Mosaic Law was abrogated is that it was impossible for it to be kept (Melanchthon).

158. The Old Testament is not a covenant, but a type of a covenant (Melanchthon).

Against the New Testament:

159. The New Testament is nothing else than a promise of all good things without law, no respect being had to our righteousness, because good things are promised us without condition, since nothing is required in return from us (Melanchthon).

160. Whatever is done under constraint of the Law is sin; hence in the New Testament there are not precepts that force, but only exhortations and entreaties (Luther).

161. Christ did not come to make a people or to impose a law (Melanchthon).

Against the Gospel:

162. The Gospel commands nothing whatever (Melanchthon), neither does it prohibit (Luther).

163. The testament of Christ is confirmed by faith by which we believe his death (Eberhard Weidensee.)

164. Christ bore every penalty in the New Testament, and only permitted his Word to act (Luther).

[165: Missing in original.]

166. The Gospel is nothing but a preaching concerning the resurrection of Christ; hence works here are entirely removed (Luther).

167. Scripture does not distinguish Law and Gospel, so that you would think only that to be Gospel which Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote, and the books of Moses to be nothing but law, but the doctrine of the Gospel is scattered through the books of the Old and New Testament (Melanchthon).

168. Just as circumcision is nothing, so also baptism and the partaking of the Lord's Supper (Melanchthon).

Against Angels:

169. The wicked do not have angels of their own ap-

pointed for their guardianship; this pertains only to the elect (Bugenhausen).

Against the Church:

170. Only the predestinated are in the Church, but the wicked or reprobate are not of the Church (Bucer).

171. Whoever is in the Church cannot be damned (Zwingli).

In Regard to Contingency:

172. All things that occur, occur according to divine predestination; hence our will has no freedom. For according to His predestination all things occur to all creatures necessarily (Melanchthon).

173. All things occur by absolute necessity (Luther).

In Regard to Evangelical Counsels:

174. Between the Commandments and the Evangelical Counsels, there is no distinction (Melanchthon).

175. There is but one Evangelical Counsel, viz., virginity (Luther); although this is not praised in Scripture.

176. It is impossible for an Evangelical Counsel to become a commandment (Luther).

Against the Commandments:

177. The commandments of God are impossible (Melanchthon). You are doing very wrong in denying that our Saviour commanded impossibilities (Luther to Silesius). [Faber].

Against the Lord's Day:

178. The Sabbath does not signify the religion of the seventh day; and since the abrogation of the Law, all days are equal (Melanchthon).

179. There are some who think that the Sabbath ought

still to be observed, since we have Scripture for this, and not for the Lord's Day.

180. The Lord's Day was instituted only that men might meet to hear the Word of God (Bucer, non ferianda; Oscairdg [?], Glaib [?], Carlstadt).

Against Sin:

181. The "fomes" is truly actual sin, an actual privation of that which ought to be present, a thing that is alive and that daily excites to sin (Luther, Rieg). [Urbanus Rhegius (?)]

182. Every sin is ignorance (Melanchthon). And invincible ignorance does not excuse sin (Luther).

183. The distinction made to-day between venial and mortal sin is wrong, since every affection of concupiscence is mortal sin (Melanchthon). Every sin according to its nature, is mortal, but it is venial to those who are in Christ (Luther).

184. Original Sin is no sin, but a natural defect, like stammering (Zwingli).

185. Original Sin is an actual wicked desire; hence Scripture does not distinguish between Actual and Original Sin (Melanchthon).

186. Original Sin always remains (Luther).

Against Faith:

187. Faith alone justifies, not works, because faith and works directly antagonize; hence works cannot be taught without injuring faith (Luther).

188. An error in faith does not hurt, provided only one believe that Christ, our Lord, have saved and redeemed us (Bucer).

189. There are no works so wicked as to be able to accuse and condemn believers in Christ (Luther); where there is faith, no sin injures.

190. He who has once believed that Jesus Christ has

redeemed him, has the seal of the Holy Spirit, and can never sin unto death (Bucer).

191. Christ has ordained that there should be no sin but unbelief, and no righteousness but faith (Luther).

192. It is necessary to elevate faith above all virtues; but it is removed by any crime (*ib*).

193. We have no doubt whatever that we are saved when we are baptized; since the promise there made is not mutable with respect to any sins. Hence one baptized, even though he so will, cannot lose salvation, because no sin but unbelief can condemn him. All others are swallowed up by faith in a moment (Luther).

194. Faith alone is necessary; all other things are most free, neither commanded nor prohibited (Luther).

195. Love does not justify, but faith which is preferred to love (Melanchthon). Moreover it justifies with respect to no works, whether good or bad.

196. Only unbelievers are wicked (Zwingli), because it is with God, not with men that they deal by means of works.

197. Faith never respects past, but only future things (Luther).

198. Acquired "fides informis" is a dream, a matter unknown to Holy Scripture, taught by the prostitutes of the Pope (Luther); an insanity (Melanchthon).

Against Works:

199. All the works of men, however praiseworthy in appearance, are altogether vicious and are sins worthy of death (Melanchthon).

200. Wicked deeds do not make a wicked man (Luther).

201. The commandments are necessarily fulfilled prior to all works (Luther).

202. We are, we have been, we always remain equals before God (Luther).

203. God cares not for our works; or if they be anything before Him, nevertheless all are equal as to merit.

Against Merits:

204. Paul dissipates the dreams of theologians who, to obtain grace, have invented "*meritum congrui et digni*." (Luther; Rieger).

205. To say that our works are meritorious is to detract from the honor and merit of Christ (Haller), because there is no merit in man whatsoever (Zwingli).

206. The grace of God is not a quality in us (Melanchthon). He who believes, loves (Nuremberg provosts).

Against Love:

207. All the commandments of God are to be observed in love; for one not killing, sins, if this be not in love (Luther). So one in sin giving alms or doing any other good work, sins (Luther).

208. Love does not abide in the eternal home (Zwingli).

209. The Christian is on his guard lest he ever be uncertain as to whether he be in the grace of God, or whether his works please God; for he who doubts as to this, sins, and loses all his works (Luther).

210. The statement is most certain, that we are always most certain of the remission of sin. The saints know that they are in grace, and their sins are forgiven (Melanchthon).

211. Acts of hope and of faith are not distinguished in Scripture (*ib*).

212. I regard it a human fancy that a habit is one thing, and an act, another. Faith, accordingly is nothing but a movement of the heart and means "to believe" (Luther).

213. The freedom of the Gospel consists in the fact that all power of accusing has been wrested from the Law, as well as of condemning us; *i.e.*, if you have sinned, you cannot be damned (Melanchthon).

Against the Sacraments:

214. A sacrament is a recent invention (Luther), and

there are only three Sacraments, viz., Baptism, Penitence, and the Holy Supper (Luther); elsewhere he states but two (Glaib).

215. The Sacraments of the New do not differ from those of the Old Testament, so far as efficacy of significance is concerned (Luther, Bucer).

Against Baptism:

216. Baptism neither justifies nor profits any one, but it is only faith in the word of promise, to which Baptism is added, that accomplishes this (Luther, Melanchthon).

217. Baptism, even so far as the sign is concerned, is not a momentary, but a permanent matter (Luther).

218. To baptize is incomparably greater than to consecrate bread and wine (Luther).

219. For this reason Baptism cannot be administered except by a priest (Luther).

220. Baptism pertains no less to the second than to the first forgiveness (Melanchthon).

221. Penitence has no other sacramental sign than Baptism (Melanchthon).

222. It is pernicious to believe that so far as a son of light is concerned, the force of Baptism is lost by sin (Luther).

223. Baptism has respect to the entire course of our life (Luther).

224. The Baptism of Christ and that of John is the same (Zwingli). Accordingly, John the Baptist preached the Gospel before Christ (Zwingli).

225. The form of Baptism is not "in the Name of the Father," but "I baptize thee in the Names of the Father and of the Son," etc. (Zwingli).

226. The water of Baptism is not to be blessed, neither is exorcism to precede Baptism; but, all ceremonies being excluded, we are to use Baptism in the most simple way, as Christ instituted it (Jo. Landtsperger).

227. Infants are not to be baptized; but when those baptized have attained the use of reason, they are to be rebaptized (Balthasar [Hubmaier] and all the Anabaptists).

228. Baptism does not profit an infant, unless it have a faith of its own (Luther, Rieger, Weidensee, Landtsperger). But infused faith is a fictitious thing (Osualdus, Glaib).

229. It is not the laver of Baptism, but only the blood of Christ, that removes Original Sin (Luther).

Infants:

230. Infants of Christians, if not prevented, I believe are not condemned (Zwingli).

231. A child must not be hurried to Baptism; for even God cannot give faith to it, when baptized, and it is lost; and he can give faith to an unbaptized child, who is to be saved (Weidensee).

232. It is not certain, then, that a child departing after Baptism, is saved (Weidensee). One, then, is ignorant concerning a child departing without Baptism (Landtsperger).

233. If one would bring up children, and know that all are eternally lost, he should not be grieved on this account, nor once lament (Weidensee).

Against the "Character":

234. The "character" impressed in Baptism or in Ordination, is a fictitious matter, and without Scriptural authority (Luther, Melanchthon, Rieger, Zwingli).

Against Confirmation:

235. Confirmation and Extreme Unction are not sacraments instituted by Christ (Luther, Zwingli).

Against the Eucharist:

236. In the Eucharist, the substance of bread and wine remains; because transubstantiation is a figment of sophists and Romanists (Pirkheimer, Melanchthon).

237. I firmly believe not only that the body of Christ is in the bread, but also that the bread is the body of Christ (Luther).

238. As the body of Christ is in the bread, where there is neither blood nor soul, so the blood of Christ in the wine is without body and soul (Luther).

239. In the Eucharist, the true body of Christ is not really, but figuratively only and as in a sign (Zwingli, Ecolampadius, Capito, Keller, Retenack).

240. I do not know whether it was a greater abomination to worship the golden calf in Dan, or that bread (Zwingli).

241. The Eucharist is the idol of Moazim, which, according to Daniel, we have worshipped in the Holy Place, and is true idolatry (Zwingli).

242. The body of Christ can be only in one place; hence if it is to be received by us, it must leave the Right Hand of the Father (Zwingli).

243. The miracles wrought in the Eucharist have Satan as their author (Ecolampadius, from the Father of Lies).

244. There is much danger in the adoration of the Eucharist; for this reason, it would be better not to adore it, for such was the practice of the Apostles. Neither is Christ there in order to be adored (Luther).

Against Processions:

245. Where the Eucharist enclosed in gold and silver is carried about with pomp and external adoration in a procession, this is nothing else than to make sport of God (Luther, Pirkheimer, Lang, Strauss).

246. Therefore that the Eucharist should be made a show of or be carried about, or be laid aside in an ark, are abuses of the Eucharist; but that it should be imprisoned is a sport of demons (Pirkheimer, Glaib, Balthasar [Hubmaier]).

Against Communion:

247. That no one should receive the Eucharist except

fasting, is a madness madder than any madness; so it is ridiculous that a layman should not handle the Eucharist, the Cup, since he can communicate himself (Luther). Afterwards, however, he prohibited this.

248. They only commune worthily whose consciences are afflicted, confused, and erroneous, and burdened with sins (Luther).

249. The greatest sins are committed at Easter on account of the impious requirement of the Pope requiring men to commune, even more than at the Carnival (Luther).

250. It is my faithful advice that a Christian in Lent and at Easter, should neither confess nor come to the communion, and that he should think: For this very reason I will not do what that man, the Pope, here commands, but I would do it if he had not commanded it (Luther).

Both Kinds:

251. To deny both kinds to the laity is godless and tyrannical, and bishops sin, who give one kind alone (Luther, Osiander).

252. The Greeks and others are not to be accounted heretics or schismatics on account of both kinds, but the Romans are rather to be so accounted (Luther).

253. It would be better to receive neither part than one alone, since it is a snare most harmful to souls to commune once a year under one form (Luther, Zwingli).

254. A layman, without the desire to receive the other form, is godless and denies Christ (Luther).

Against Confession:

255. Confession not made into the ear, cannot be approved by divine law, neither was this done originally, but then it was public (Luther, Zwingli, Œcolampadius).

256. That secret sins pertain to sacramental confession can be proved in no way of reason or from the Scriptures;

I suspect that this was an invention either of the avaricious or the curious. (Luther, the Psychityranni, Ecolampadius, Rieger, Strauss).

257. A priest ought to absolve a penitent from punishment and guilt, or he sins; a superior likewise sins in reserving cases to himself (Luther).

258. Circumstances are to be entirely disregarded; the observance of places, times, persons, is of no account, and should it be made it is another superstitious assumption (Luther, Carlstadt).

Penitence:

259. Penitence lacks any sign divinely instituted; accordingly, it is not properly a sacrament, but a way and return to baptism (Luther, Melanchthon).

260. If St. John had taught that fear is the beginning of penitence, it, nevertheless, would not follow that penitence begins in fear (Luther).

261. It is false and dangerous to think that penance is "the second raft after shipwreck" (Luther, Melanchthon).

Against the Keys:

262. The keys are not given except to one who is righteous and holy in spirit (Luther, Ecolampadius, Bucer).

263. To bind and to loose is nothing else than to preach the Gospel (Luther, Zwingli).

264. The laws concerning Satisfaction, by which we are taught to blot out sins by our works, are impious. Here see that the contrary has been condemned by Christ, viz.: all things pertaining to the Canonical Law and the Kingdom of the Pope (Luther).

Satisfaction:

265. No satisfaction is required for sins, except the death of Christ (Melanchthon, Rieger, Zwingli, Luther).

266. The Sacrament of Penitence has been abolished by prelates in the Church (Luther).

267. Any one can absolve any one; accordingly the freest authority of hearing confessions is to be conceded to all brethren and sisters (Luther).

Ordination:

268. The Church of Christ ignores the sacrament of Ordination (Luther). But it is a figment invented by men (Zwingli, Rieger, Amsterdo).

269. As many of us as have been baptized are all equally priests; and any layman can consecrate churches, confirm children, etc. (Luther, Zwingli).

The Mass:

270. The Gospel does not allow the Mass as a sacrifice, because to retain the use of masses under the name of sacrifices is to deny Christ (Luther, Rieger).

271. At any hour and as often as one wish, he can celebrate Mass (Luther). Nevertheless, one can no more offer for another than he can drink for him (Zwingli).

272. They lie who say that the Mass of a wicked priest is useful *ex opere operato* (Luther). Although the name "Mass" is improperly transferred hither (Zwingli).

273. The office of the Mass is not satisfactory, as offered for the dead, the troubled, or as applied for another (Luther).

274. The Mass has been changed into a sacrifice of Satan, and that, too, by a common error; but this is the very worst idolatry and infidelity, and is worse than heathen (Luther, Rieger).

275. We condemn and despise the Canon of the Mass, by the authority of the Gospel (Luther); because it is false and has nothing solid in it (Zwingli, Nuremberg preachers).

276. To-day the celebrants of the Mass are idolaters,

and commit idolatry as often as they sacrifice (Luther, Ecolampadius).

277. All private masses are to be abrogated; but on every Lord's Day, and then only, the Eucharist alone is to be consecrated (Luther).

278. Nay, all masses, both public and private, are to be abrogated (Zwingli, Bucer, Capito, Haller, Blaurer, Rottenacker).

279. Water is not to be put into the Cup in the Mass; because it is a wicked and unfavorable sign (Zwingli, Luther, Carlstadt).

Canonical Hours:

280. I believe that they sin more who read the hours coldly, than they who omit them; for they are hypocrites. There is scarcely greater sin than that which proceeds from this laborious worship of God which is rendered by crying out through those Canonical Hours (Luther). Accordingly the prelates at Nuremberg have dispensed with Matins and Completorium.

Matrimony:

281. Matrimony is not a sacrament divinely instituted, but one invented by men in the Church (Luther).

282. The conjugal debt is a sin, and, according to Ps. 51, altogether mad (Luther). Yea, it is never paid without sin (*ib*).

283. Priests ought to ratify all marriages that have no other impediment than that of the Papal, but not of the Divine Law (Luther). Every priest, yea every brother, or any one can make a dispensation for himself with regard to impediments decreed by the Church (Zwingli).

284. It is lawful to marry the daughter of one's sister, or niece; likewise the children of two brothers or sisters may marry; or one may marry the sister of his wife or

connection by marriage; also no spiritual relationship hinders matrimony (Luther, Zwingli).

285. Marriages of children contracted against the will of their parents are invalid; hence the title "De Clandestina Desponsione" is from Satan (Luther).

286. If those contracting marriage have not completed nineteen years, the marriage is invalid (Thuringian Consistory).

287. If any one violate a virgin, he will not be obliged to give her anything except a pair of shoes (A new Thuringian law that fell from heaven).

Divorce:

288. When a man is impotent, let the wife seek a divorce; but if he be unwilling, let her, with the consent of her husband, have intercourse with another, or the brother of her husband in secret marriage, and let the offspring be accounted those of the reputed father. The woman is safe in a state of safety (Luther).

289. For I prefer bigamy to divorce (Luther), (as the Lutheran monks have shown effectually).

290. If a wife do not obey her husband when he asks for the conjugal debt, let him call in a servant girl. Yea, on this account, he can ask for a divorce (Luther).

291. Divorce occurs not only on account of adultery, but for other more grave reasons. Suppose a husband be under sentence of death, a madman, quarrelsome, withdrawing from his wife without her consent and long absent! (Thuringians, on Epithal., Luther).

292. When the divorce has been decreed it is allowable for the innocent party to marry, unless the guilty party should be hindered (Luther, Melanchthon).

293. It is an error to break the marriage, if, before it has been consummated, one of the couple enter a monastery or convent (Luther).

294. Former betrothals are not broken if one have afterwards known a second spouse (Luther).

Celibacy:

295. Ordination does not hinder marriage or break the contract, but celibacy has been introduced by the devil (Luther).

296. By virtue of the words of Paul, I absolve all priests from celibacy; for between a priest and a true wife, there is a true and inseparable marriage, approved by the commandments of God. This the godless forbid from pure tyranny (Luther, Zwingli, Zell, Blaurer, Stoerer).

297. The Nicene Council concedes marriage to priests (Spengler of Nuremberg, Zwingli, Rieger).

298. In the time of Augustine, no one opposed the marriage of priests (Zwingli).

299. It is allowable for a priest, for a bishop, not only to marry, but the second, third, and fourth time, whether the bride be a virgin or one who has been corrupted.

Vows:

300. Would that I were able to persuade all persons either to altogether abolish or avoid all vows (Luther, Lambert, Avinio).

301. If a vow be dispensable, any brother can make such dispensation for his neighbor, or he can dispense himself; if a neighbor cannot so dispense, there is then no law by which the Pope can do it (Carlstadt, Eberlein).

302. The mode of life proceeding from a vow is without a precedent in the Scriptures (Luther, Blaurer, Ketenbach, Lambert).

303. Parents have the right to remove children from monasteries, who have entered without their consent. If the Pope say the contrary, he lies (Luther).

304. Religious vows conflict directly with the Gospel

of Christ and Baptism, and are opposed to faith and the Word of God (Luther, Lambert).

305. To become a monk is to apostatize from the faith, to deny Christ, and to become a Jew; their vows, accordingly, are worthless (Luther).

306. For a man to be continent is an impossibility; but just as it is necessary for man to eat and drink, and to sleep, so also is it to have sexual intercourse. Hence no man can be without a woman, nor any woman without a man (Luther).

307. The state of virginity is beneath the marriage estate, than which there is none better on earth (Luther). If Jerome had known that marriage would be one of the seven sacraments of a part of the Church, he would have banished virginity, and would have spoken more reverently concerning marriage (Some).

308. All vows are temporary and mutable (Luther, Lambert).

309. No monk or priest can be a Christian (Luther, Zwingli).

310. Castigations voluntarily assumed by men, like voluntary fastings, are repudiated by Paul (Bucer).

311. We properly think that all monasteries and cathedral churches and like abominations, should be entirely abolished (Luther to the Duke of Savoy).

312. I discourage all from entering any religious order, unless he know that the works of the members of these orders however arduous and holy, in God's eyes are no better than the works of farmers laboring in the fields (Luther).

313. Whatever is promised men in secular matters is to be fulfilled, but in matters of conscience, if anything be promised God, it is not to be kept (Zwingli).

314. No saint became a saint through Monasticism (Luther).

Poverty:

315. Evangelical poverty is exacted of men by divine right, accordingly no vow should be made (Melanchthon).

316. To establish a mode of life for begging likewise conflicts with the Gospel (Melanchthon, Luther).

317. Monasticism is of the devil (Zwingli, Lambert).

318. Would that all monks and nuns would flee from the cloisters, and that all cloisters throughout the whole world were to be abolished (Luther).

319. All Carthusians, all monks and nuns depart from that which has been ordained and from liberty, when they imagine that they are polluted by eating meat (Luther, Lambert).

320. Put before your eyes the infinite crowd of priests and nuns, with their masses, sacrifices, laws, doctrines, and all their works; and you will see nothing but a theatre of Satan, godless people of perdition, reserved for the wrath of God forever (Luther).

321. Church ceremonies always obscure liberty and the force of the Gospel; hence it is profitable to disregard them (Melanchthon, Nuremberg preachers).

322. Unctions, tonsures, ceremonial vestments, benedictions of water, salt, palms, candles, herbs, consecrations of churches, altars, vases, men etc. are human inventions (Zwingli, Lambert, Bucer, preachers of Nuremberg).

Against Purgatory:

323. There is no purgatory after this life (Zwingli, Osiander, Ecolampadius, Capito, Bucer, Lambert, Rieger, Rottenacker).

324. It would be safer to deny all purgatory than to believe Gregory in his Dialogues (Luther).

325. Here sink anniversaries, vigils for the dead, depositions, the seventh, the thirtieth, fraternities, oblations, and other inventions of men (Zwingli). Chanting, organs,

candles, ornaments, vestments, chrism, disappear (Luther, Lambert, Balthasar [Hubmaier]).

326. We have no command to pray for the dead; you may, therefore, pray once or twice for a dead person, but afterwards cease lest you tempt God or distrust Him (Luther).

327. Moreover that perpetual masses are founded upon this, and that, every year, the cry ascends as though God had not heard before that year, is death and the devil, unbelief, makes sport of God, and such prayer is mere blasphemy (Luther).

328. The office for the dead is of about as much service to deceased Christians as it is to dead cattle (the unhappy provosts of Nuremberg).

329. No Christian implicates himself in masses and prayers for the dead, unless he be willing to deny Christ, to repudiate Baptism, and to act in opposition to the whole Bible (*ib*).

330. If you have in your house a spirit who when adjured seeks for aid by means of masses and prayers, account him without any hesitation as the devil; because from the beginning of the world until now no soul has appeared, neither does God so permit (Luther).

331. No images are to be kept in the church, but rather to be destroyed and burned; nay, neither publicly nor privately are they to be retained, or to be painted or carved; for they are relics of the old idolatry contrary to the Second Commandment (Zwingli, Bucer, Haller, Carlstadt).

332. It is under the tutelage of Satan that the term "Free Will" has entered, and that, with the purpose of seducing men from the way of right; for it is a mere figment, since the will contributes nothing towards its own willing, and that it has any activity in good works is erroneous (Luther, Carlstadt, Rieger).

333. The name fraternity forbids one from being superior to another, and, especially in spiritual things from

having more right and inheritance than his brother (Luther).

334. We Christians are free, exempt from all the laws of men, liberated through Baptism (Luther).

335. No laws can be imposed with any right upon Christians, whether by men or by angels, unless so far as they be willing (Luther).

336. Subjects neither can, nor will, nor ought to endure your tyranny any longer (Luther to the Princes).

337. The Emperor and the Princes deal in manifest falsehoods and publish contradictory commandments (Luther).

338. That the Pope has transferred the power from the Greeks to the Germans is either the chief or greatest mark of Antichrist, and is most deceptive (Luther).

339. I regret that I submitted to the Emperor at Worms. Whatever tolerance of my doctrine was conceded by my judges is of no account to tyrants (Luther).

340. There is no more excellent secular law than that of the Turk, as he has no canonical and civil law (Luther).

341. The secular Princes are stupid, and according to their stupid brain they want to lead the [saints?] into schools and publish directions, and if the Emperor would give a command, they want to appear as though they were seriously doing what was commanded (Luther).

342. The madness of foolish men is directed to the extinction of the faith, because they want to force men to believe (Luther).

343. God has delivered the Princes up to a reprobate mind, and he wants to put an end to them just as to ecclesiastical houses (Luther).

344. The secular government is at just as low a stage as that of the ecclesiastical tyrants, so that the one will not perish without the other (Luther).

345. Princes prohibiting Luther's New Testament act like murderers of Christ, such as Herod; but these tyrants act

as the secular Princes are accustomed to do, in order to satisfy their titles (Luther).

346. Ever since the beginning of the world, a wise prince has been a most rare bird; for generally they are either the greatest fools or the very worst rascals; for they are God's policemen and executioners (Luther).

347. The common people have now become intelligent and wise; a blow to Princes is clearly impending from the side of the people and rabble. I fear that it cannot be prevented (Luther).

348. The Turk is ten times as wise and just as our Princes; how then could such fools be prospered against the Turk (Luther).

349. In the halls of Princes, the devil sits in the highest place, and has there his chief throne (Luther).

350. The kingdom of France, from its impious service to Antichrist, has been impiously called most Christian (Luther). He also has treated the Most Noble King of England with the greatest insults, wrongs and reproaches.

351. The sin of robbery is now an honor and title of the nobility (Luther).

352. If the peasants prevail, then the devil is abbot; if the Princes prevail, the master will be an abbess (Luther).

353. The kingdom of the Pope is nothing but tyranny, the realm of Antichrist with his faces (Luther). Yea, he is Antichrist himself, the son of perdition (Lambert).

354. The name of Pope is recent, unheard of in the time of [Pope] Nicholas [I.], or of Augustinet (Zwingli).

355. Bishops ought to be grave men, married, laymen, advanced in years (Luther and all).

356. It is not allowable for a bishop to do aught except to teach the Word of God. Preaching the Gospel is so peculiarly the prerogative of a bishop, that it is not proper to substitute another for him, to teach in his place. If, therefore, he do not teach, he is not a bishop (Melancthon).

357. There is no ecclesiastical authority over men (Bucer). Hence the bishops have usurped the jurisdiction which belongs to the secular princes (Luther, Rieger, Zwingli, Blaurer).

358. Ecclesiastical power is not of God (Luther).

359. Christ subjected himself and his Church to secular power (Haller). This immunity of churches and freedom of the clergy has ceased (Luther).

360. The civil, but not the ecclesiastical power has the authority to make and ordain laws (Melanchthon).

361. To impose law upon Christians is to tempt the devil (Zwingli).

Constitutions:

362. Neither the Constitutions of the Church nor the Ordinances of the Apostles put the conscience under any obligation (Bucer).

363. We are, therefore, under no obligation to celebrate the festivals of the saints, to fast in Lent and on other days, to abstain from flesh on six festival days, or to obey other human precepts (Luther, Osiander, Rieger, Zwingli).

364. No prelate, but only the Church, can excommunicate (Zwingli, Haller).

365. We confess that the world has been miserably led astray by Popes, Councils, decrees of Fathers, with these traditions, or more properly, snares of the devil (Luther).

366. No Pope or bishop has the right of imposing a single syllable upon any man (Luther).

Against Councils:

367. After one has been justified no laws or ordinances bind him (Melanchthon).

368. That was an erroneous decision by the Council that essence neither begets nor is begotten; also that the intellectual soul is man's substantial form (Luther).

369. Ordination is openly heretical and ought to be abolished (Melanchthon).

370. I declare that all the Articles of Huss at Constance were most Christian and were condemned by Antichrist and his disciples in a synagogue of Satan collected from the most worthless sophists (Luther).

Here notice, O Emperor, that the calumniator of the most holy and free Council of Constance is now making an appeal to a future Council.

371. Huss and Jerome were burned in violation of faith publicly pledged; because it was concluded in the Council that a safe conduct with heretics ought not to be kept; hence our Germans have learned from the Romans to break faith and promises (Capito).

372. The Princes of Germany once had the highest reputation for their good faith, but they have learned in obedience to the idol at Rome and to the perpetual ignominy of the nation, to despise nothing more than good faith (Luther).

373. When I was called I went to Rome, even though I knew that my public faith had been violated by the Emperor (Luther).

374. In those things that pertain to faith, every Christian is Pope and Church to himself (Luther).

375. Every Christian is allowed to judge concerning every doctrine, for we are not bound to believe Councils and Popes (Luther, Blaurer).

376. It is only a matter that should be laughed at, if a great sedition should arise against bishops and their rule; because those exposing their fortunes and bodies to such an emergency are sons of God, true Christians; and in a short time matters will come to such a pass that there will be no bishop, no prince under the sun, no cathedral church, no monastery (Luther).

377. Nothing is to be received except what is expressly taught in Holy Scripture (Zwingli, Bucer, Blaurer).

378. I will not permit you to ascribe more than one sense

to the Holy Scriptures (Zwingli, Luther.) For Scripture does not admit of a number of meanings, "literal, allegorical," etc.

379. The literal meaning of the creation of the world is hypocrisy, and a carnal opinion concerning the condition of nature (Melanchthon).

380. The Apocalypse was not written by John the Evangelist (Zwingli). The books of Baruch and Maccabees are not to be received.

381. For the Gospel to share authority with the Canon Law, is an impossibility (Luther).

382. I know that no state is successfully administered by means of laws (Luther).

383. It is impossible at the same time to observe the Gospel and human laws; accordingly, it is impossible to keep the peace and at the same time the laws (Luther).

384. There is no hope of a remedy, unless, all the laws of all men being once annulled, we judge and rule all things according to the Gospel (Luther).

385. We must not swear for temporal things; for he who requires an oath of another, or himself swears, must be of a malicious and trifling mind not regarding the truth (Melanchthon).

386. It is not allowable for a Christian for any cause to take an oath (Anabaptists). For it is unjust and contrary to the Holy Scriptures to make demands on the faith of another (Luther).

387. All are heathen who contend in court for property or reputation (Luther).

388. If anything be taken from us we ought not to demand it back in court or by war (Luther).

389. It is a doctrine of devils that it is allowable for a Christian to wage war; for all who go to war are accursed children of Cain (Ecolampadius). To buy and sell are purely heathen matters (Luther).

390. Business contracts even for godly purposes, as

churches, benefices, etc. are usurious (Strauss); or at least, unjust (Luther).

391. A community of all things is commanded in the New Testament (Melanchthon).

392. Altars are to be abolished in the New Testament, because Christ is there crucified, divided, buried, and bitten with the teeth; for the Supper, a table answers the purpose (Balthasar Hubmaier, Glaib).

393. One should not care to be buried in a cemetery, or consecrated place, because it is certain that every place blessed by man is cursed by God (Oswald, Glaib).

394. Wicked spirits will hereafter be saved together with the damned (John Denk).

395. They blaspheme who rave that the Turks or heretics should be attacked not with the Word of God, of which they are ignorant, but with war and worldly tumult, or with the din of censorships (Luther).

396. The word of Christ that many false prophets shall arise and deceive many, I verily think was spoken with reference to the universities (Melanchthon).

397. The doctrine of all the schools, speculative as well as practical has been condemned (Luther).

398. All moral virtues and speculative branches of knowledge are not true virtues and sciences, but sins and errors (Luther).

399. I doubt whether the Creed was handed down in writing by the Apostles, although I do not doubt that it was composed by Apostolic men, and yet, I doubt so far as to wish that it could be proved. Neither, unless I am mistaken, did Augustine believe this. But it was an abuse of the common people, not indeed with a godless opinion, as before. And that good man erred, and, in his Christian simplicity, was exceedingly credulous (Some).

400. Pilate was not free to acquit Christ, since his power would have been compelled to serve the madness of the Jews. It is likewise the veriest trifle to affirm that Mary

merited by herself to become the Mother of God (Some).

401. It is not entirely clear to me whether in the time of Christ's infancy, it was clearly revealed to the Virgin Mary that he was God and Man. If Mary and Joseph had known that the child Jesus was God and Man, and would suffer nothing but that which was necessary, why would they have feared and grieved for him? (Some.)

402. Jesus wished his death not to be mournful, but glorious; not to be deplored, but adored; for he was to be extolled for his victory (Some).

403. It is proper and in accord with God's word to excite seditions and tumults; hence there is no better proof that my doctrine is of God, than that it excites discords, seditions, and tumults (Luther). Many of them, therefore, have often publicly testified to the common people: "The Gospel wants blood." (Zwingli, etc.)

404. Among Christians, there should be no superiority, no courts, nothing fenced up or closed, no "meum" or "teum," no restraint or excommunication; and this they want to be frequent (Anabaptists).

Moreover, who Luther is I will learn; for he wants to be heard. I was the very first whom God put into the field. I never have been false to my trust. Had I been disposed to proceed impulsively, I could have caused great shedding of blood in Germany; aye, I could have begun the game at Worms, if the Emperor had not been safe. I am also the one to whom God first revealed this, that I might proclaim these words to you. You know not how much labor it is to contend with the devil; but I know him well, and he knows me well; for I have already eaten with him one or two bits of salt, and I would have perished, had there not been a confession.

All the articles above noted, both those of Luther himself, as clearly a man familiar with the devil, and of those who,

being infatuated with his errors, have so degenerated as to become deaf to the truth, we reject and anathematize each of them as heretical, or scandalous, false, and offensive to godly ears, and misleading the simple, or entirely seditious and disturbing the public peace. With respect to this, I am ready to give an account in a public disputation, at the pleasure of the Most Reverend Emperor, God aiding me, and the Virgin Mary and all Saints supporting me with their intercessions.

TO GOD ALONE THE GLORY

The day and hour of the disputation Eck will publish at the pleasure of the Emperor.

INGOLSTADT,

Printed 1530.

The Beginnings of the Lutheran Church
on Manhattan Island

By
The Late John Nicum

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH ON MANHATTAN ISLAND

BY THE LATE JOHN NICUM, PASTOR OF ST. JOHN'S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, ROCHESTER, N. Y. (DIED 1909.)

(Read December 29, 1908)

DURING the first century of the occupation of Manhattan Island by Europeans we find there two settlements of Lutherans, the one of an earlier, the other of a later date. The earlier settlement was that of Dutch Lutherans, who came over from Holland with the first settlers, whilst some seventy-five years later German Lutherans began to arrive, at first in smaller and then in ever increasing numbers until many thousands had settled mainly along the Hudson and Mohawk rivers. It is now two hundred years ago that the first colony of German Lutherans arrived in the harbor of New York. They were the Palatinates who, in 1707, because of continued political and religious disturbances, had with their pastor, the Rev. Josua von Kocherthal, left the fatherland, and found a new home near where the city of Newburgh now stands. It goes without saying, that though most of them settled along the Hudson and Mohawk rivers, yet many of them remained on the Island of Manhattan. Whilst the immigration of Lutherans from Holland, after the middle of the eighteenth century practically ceased, that of the German Lutherans increased, and the Lutheran Church on Manhattan which at first was Dutch afterwards became German. And this first German Lutheran Church in the present city of New York had

the good fortune to have among its pastors some of the most distinguished men and theologians of the eighteenth century, such as the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in this country, the Rev. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, D.D., and his son, the Rev. Frederick Augustus Conrad Muhlenberg, a man of burning patriotism, who in time became speaker of the First and Third Congresses of the United States. He was the grandfather of the sainted William Augustus Muhlenberg, the sweet singer of the well known hymns "Like Noah's weary Dove," "Saviour, Who Thy Flock Art Feeding," and especially of that one which has been of such comfort to so many: "I Would not Live Alway." As Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, in 1748, founded the oldest Lutheran Synod in this country, to wit: "The Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States," so his son Frederick Augustus Conrad, in 1773, organized the second oldest body, to wit: "The Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States." His brother-in-law, the Rev. John Christopher Kunze, D.D., served the congregation for twenty-three years and was during this time also connected with Columbia University, then King's College, as professor of the Semitic languages.

But it is not to the German Lutherans that we desire to call attention in this paper, but to the earlier settlement of Lutherans who had emigrated from Holland, and, who, for more than fifteen years, were punished by fine and imprisonment for conducting and attending private religious services in their homes. And this occurred in what is now the metropolis of that country which is known the world over as the ideal home of freedom of worship and of liberty of conscience!

The first mention of Lutherans on Manhattan Island is, so far as known at the present time, in 1643, by Father Jogues, in his description of the settlement. Among several other religious societies he mentions also the Lutherans, as being represented on the island. That the great majority of

these Lutherans had come from Holland, there can be no doubt. The history of the colony proves this. Also the names signed to the various letters and petitions of the members of the Lutheran congregation are those of persons belonging to this nationality. In their distress they appeal to the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam for help and advice. In 1648, the Church of the Unaltered Confession of Augsburg sends a delegation to the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam requesting the sending of a pastor. There is no entry of this in the minutes of the Consistory, but the congregation refers to this delegation in a letter written in 1652. The first entry on the minutes of the Consistory, pertaining to the Lutherans on Manhattan, is under date Oct. 8, 1649, and reads as follows: "The petition of the members of the congregation of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith in the New Netherlands was read. They desire a pastor. The matter will be kept in mind."

Under date of Oct. 19 (1649), we read: "The request of the church in the New Netherlands is taken up and considered." But a pastor is not sent. The reason is not stated. The Consistory did certainly neither lack the men nor the means to aid their brethren in the New World. At this time the names of not less than 31 Lutheran churches in all parts of Holland appear in the minutes, who were looking to the Consistory of Amsterdam for men to supply their pulpits. We mention Rotterdam, The Hague, Deventer, Arnheim, Edam, Dort. And although the Consistory at that time had no theological school of its own as at present, it sent its beneficiaries to Strassburg, Jena, and especially to Tübingen to be educated under the influence of the learned Lutheran confessor, Tobias Wagner. Neither did the Consistory lack the means nor the spirit of liberality, as it aided a number of Lutheran churches outside of Holland, such as Augsburg and especially Magdeburg, which had suffered so severely during the Thirty Years' War. The reason was, that the sending of men to preach to the

Lutherans in the New Netherlands lay simply beyond their control.

Holland had been a, yea *the*, country of refuge for persons of all kinds of religious beliefs. Freedom of worship had been accorded the Lutherans from the beginning. But it was different in the New Netherlands. In 1621 the West India Company was chartered. Its purposes were the development of the traffic with America, the conversion of the Indians, and the colonization of the newly acquired territory. In 1626, the first Director-General arrived. The first church was organized in 1628. It was Dutch Reformed, as indeed this was the only religious society which the Company permitted to conduct public worship in the colony. Thus, Father Jogues reports in 1643 that no religion is publicly exercised except the Calvinistic, and that the orders are to admit no one but Calvinists. In 1647, Peter Stuyvesant had become Director-General or Governor. A zealot in the interests of the Dutch Reformed Church, he showed himself intolerant and bigoted over against those of another faith. Says Dr. Corwin in his history of the Dutch Reformed Church at page 42: "The failing fortunes of the West India Company together with Stuyvesant's arbitrary character in general go far to explain the intolerant spirit towards other bodies of Christians which now began to manifest itself. This unchristian spirit of bigotry was the temporary blemish on the colony." Stuyvesant was determined that there should be but one church in the colony, and that the members of all other faiths should identify themselves with it. With unrelenting energy he pursued this policy for seventeen years, being heartily supported by the dominees, Megapolensis and Drisius as well as by the Classis of Amsterdam and the Synod of North Holland. When, in 1655, New Sweden fell into the power of the West India Company, Stuyvesant banished two of the three Lutheran pastors, who served the churches there and allowed only one to remain, and, it seems, the

least desirable of the three. He became so notorious for his severity that in 1663 the West India Company ordered him to stop imprisoning and fining the Lutherans and Quakers on account of their religious views, and exercise toleration in the colony.

In view of these conditions prevailing in the New Netherlands, it is not difficult to understand why no Lutheran offered himself to go as pastor to America, and why, even if one should have said: "Here am I, send me," the Consistory would have hesitated to assume the risk. Hence, the next step on the part of the congregation on Manhattan was to remonstrate against the oppressive measures employed by Stuyvesant, and to ask for religious toleration. Five years after their request for a pastor, the Lutherans on Manhattan sent the following petition to the States General of the United Netherlands:

"Manhattan, Oct. 1, 1653.

"We, members of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith, your loyal and obedient subjects, reside under the jurisdiction of the New Netherlands on Manhattan, at Fort Orange, and upon Long Island. We number 150 families, and come from all parts of Europe, some of us having been here longer than others.

"We have never enjoyed freedom of our religion according to the Confession of Augsburg, and our souls are longing for a competent and faithful minister of the Confession of Augsburg.

"We, therefore, humbly pray that you will grant us such freedom of religion, whereby the Church of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith may also prosper in these lands as, by your grace, it prospers in the Netherlands.

"We have no doubt that, after giving this matter due consideration, you will grant us this our petition, permit the free exercise of our religion and the services of a pastor of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith, whom we will ourselves support.

"If we should be favored with the granting of this our request, we will continue to pray for your prosperity and happy government, as we have prayed in the past etc."

A similar petition was, three days later, addressed by the same persons to the West India Company, stating that, under the present Governor, freedom of religion is not permitted and requesting them to instruct him to grant them the privilege which their fellow-religionists had always enjoyed in the home country.

On the same day a letter was also addressed to the Consistory of the Lutheran Church in Amsterdam. The three letters were entrusted by them to one of their members, Paul Schricken, who made the journey to Holland and delivered them in person. In the letter to the Consistory, they also mention that they had transmitted a copy of their appeal to the General States, the West India Company, and to the Director, Peter Stuyvesant, and again urge that a pastor be sent them. They offer a salary of 800 guilders per annum and wood for the entire year. The pastor who is sent must be "apt, a graduate of a university, learned, eloquent, single, and blameless in his walk and conversation." He must likewise be able to lead the singing. The letter also refers to a delegation sent by the church to Amsterdam as early as 1648 for the purpose of securing the services of a pastor. Of this matter there is, as we have seen, no record in the minutes of the Consistory. In a postscript it is added, that when a copy of these petitions was handed to Stuyvesant he remarked that, as far as he was concerned, he had no objection to the free exercise of the Lutheran faith according to the Confession of Augsburg, but that, before leaving Holland, he had been required to take an oath, not to tolerate any other religious denomination than the Reformed. "He assured us that if the government is willing to grant religious liberty, he is willing to aid in establishing the same."

With reference to this letter the minutes of the Consistory

say: "Jan'y 20, 1654, a letter was delivered, written by several members of our congregation in the New Netherlands, earnestly requesting that we should send them a pastor of our Lutheran Confession. Upon hearing the petition it is resolved to aid the congregation in securing a pastor, and for that purpose address a letter to the Directors of the high and mighty West India Company."

The copies of the letters addressed to the government of the Netherlands and to the West India Company and handed to Director Stuyvesant, the latter turned over to pastors Megapolensis and Drisius of the Reformed Church on Manhattan. Without delay, these gentlemen addressed the following letter to the Classis of Amsterdam, dated Oct. 6th: "On Oct. 4, it happened that certain Lutheran residents here prepared and presented a certain request to our Governor, asking permission to call a Lutheran minister from Holland. This would tend to the injury of our Church, the diminution of hearers of the Word of God, and the increase of dissensions. These petitioners have made the same request twice before to our Governor, and now have addressed also their High Mightinesses, the States of Holland, and the Honorable Directors of the West India Company. Therefore, it is our humble and earnest request, that your reverend body will use all your influence with the Honorable Directors of the Company, that they may so provide and determine that the project of our Lutheran friends will be rejected, and thus the welfare, prosperity, and edification of the church of this place promoted. For as long as no other religion than the Reformed is tolerated, all who wish to engage in public worship come to our services. By this means it has happened that several, among whom are some of the principal Lutherans, have united with us in the Lord's Supper. We have communicated these matters to the Honorable Directors, in whom we have the greatest confidence. Our Governor is zealous for the Reformed religion, and would rather relinquish his office than grant permission in

this matter, since it is contrary to the first article of his commission, which was confirmed by him with an oath, not to permit any other than the Reformed doctrine." We learn from this letter that, before writing to the Classis, they had already addressed the directors of the West India Company, urging them not to grant the request of the Lutherans.

Twenty days before the letters of the Lutherans reached Holland, the Classis had already acted. Jan'y 1, it addressed a letter to the West India Company saying: "The Lutherans in the New Netherlands have desired to call a pastor from Holland and organize congregations." Our protest against granting the request "was presented to the Directors of the West India Company, and they have responded that they are inclined to oppose the plan of the Lutherans, and that they, with the Church in the New Netherlands, believe that such permission would be most injurious. And as the Lutherans had also made known their request to the States of Holland, and as there was danger that they might grant the petition, they, the West India Company, would take care of this matter, and would bind themselves to resist the request of the Lutherans."

The West India Company on Feb'y 23, 1654, resolved "not to permit any Lutheran pastor in the New Netherlands, nor any other worship than the Reformed, and to transmit this resolution at the first opportunity to the Governor, and to announce the same to the church at New Amsterdam."

Under date of Feb'y 26, 1654, the Classis informs pastors Megapolensis and Drisius, that it is grieved because of the restlessness of the Lutherans, requesting permission to hold public divine services for themselves, thereby hindering the pure doctrine and obstructing its course. "But you have acted very well and prudently, in that you have addressed a complaint to the West India Company requesting them not to grant the petition of the Lutherans. At the

same time you have also asked our Classis to lend you its helping hand. This we have willingly undertaken. We have made known your request to the Hon. Lords Directors, and urged favorable action. And they have notified us that they have refused the request of the Lutherans in every particular, and have resolved to tolerate no other exercise of divine worship except that of the true Reformed religion. Hence, we do not doubt that the Reformed doctrine will remain unembarrassed and be maintained without being hindered by the Lutherans and other erring spirits."

In their letter to Stuyvesant, dated March 12, the Directors say: "We have decided absolutely to deny the request made by some of our inhabitants, adhering to the Augsburg Confession, for a preacher and the free exercise of their religion, pursuant to the customs hitherto observed by us, and we recommend to you also, not to receive any similar petitions, but rather to turn them off in the most civil and least offensive way, and to employ all possible but moderate means in order to induce them to listen, and finally join the Reformed Church."

Encouraged by this support which his views on religious matters in the New Netherlands received from the Directors in Holland, Stuyvesant, in 1655, when the Lutheran colony of New Sweden was annexed by him, exiled, as already said, two of the three pastors of the Lutheran churches there established, and would also have driven off the third had he not been afraid of the Indians who were warm friends of the Swedes.

But notwithstanding the fact that the Lutherans came late with their petition, the Directors of the West India Company having, upon presentation of the case by Stuyvesant and his pastors on the one hand, and the Classis of Amsterdam on the other, already decided against them, still the Lutherans in the New Netherlands were not dismayed, but two years later renewed their efforts. In a letter, dated New Amsterdam Nov. 1, 1656, and addressed to the Consistory

of the Lutheran Church at Amsterdam, this body is informed that, although their petition for the free exercise of their religion had been denied them, they would nevertheless urge the Consistory to renew its efforts with the Directors of the Company, and to send them a pastor. But permission from the Company would have to be secured first, as otherwise there was danger that the minister would, in all probability, be returned to Holland.

The Consistory had, however, in the spring of that year already renewed its efforts with the Directors, and not without success, as appears from the following entry on the minutes of the Consistory under date June 13, 1656: "It is communicated that the Directors of the West India Company have given the assurance, that the Lutherans in the New Netherlands should henceforth enjoy the free exercise of their religion." This resolution had also been communicated to the Director-General in the New Netherlands, under date of June 14, 1656, but not published, as the Lutherans here as late as Nov. 1, had not heard anything of it. In that letter of June 14, the Directors also find fault with Stuyvesant and his Council for issuing orders, strictly forbidding all public and private conventicles and meetings, except the usual and authorized ones, where God's Word, according to the Reformed and established custom, is preached and taught in meetings held for the religious services of the Reformed Church, conformably to the Synod of Dort, under fine of one hundred pounds Flemish to be paid by all who, in such meetings, exercise the functions of a preacher, reader, or chorister, and each person attending such meeting shall be fined 25 pounds. They say: "We would have been better pleased if you had not published the placat against the Lutherans, a copy of which you sent us, and had not committed them to prison, for it has always been our intention to treat them quietly and leniently. Hereafter you will, therefore, not publish such or similar placats without our knowledge, but

must let them have free religious exercise in their houses."

On Aug. 7, 1656, the Classis of Amsterdam is informed that the West India Company had, in conformity with the custom in vogue in Holland, granted religious liberty to the Lutherans in the New Netherlands. "The Rev. Classis is grieved at this, and finds it necessary at the earliest opportunity, even this very day, to wait upon the Directors in regard to this matter." *Min. of Classis*, Aug. 7, 1656.

The following day the Classis is informed that the Directors know of no such complete toleration of the Lutherans in the New Netherlands, but neither did they know what more there might be of such designs. The Classis, therefore, finds it advisable to carefully watch the matter, and, if possible, prevent that the free exercise of their religion be granted to the Lutherans.

On Oct. 24, 1656, the adherents of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith had again petitioned Stuyvesant and his Council that in future they might not be prevented from holding divine service. They say: "These, with God's blessing, we intend to celebrate with prayer, reading and singing, until as we hope and expect, a qualified person shall come next spring from the Fatherland to be our minister and teacher, and remain here as such." And, inasmuch as they had faithfully obeyed the prohibitive order, published by edict, and had received from the West India Company the assurance that in the New Netherlands the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith would be tolerated, they confidently expected that their prayer would be granted.

The Governor replied that the petition would be sent to the Directors in Holland, and that meanwhile the order issued against conventicles and public religious assemblies must be obeyed.

During 1656, the Consistory of Amsterdam had endeavored to secure from the West India Company the con-

sent to send a pastor to the New Netherlands to minister to the spiritual wants of the Lutherans there. The minutes of Jan'y 16, 1657, say that the effort had not yet been successful. They had not yet received a definite reply, if a Lutheran pastor would be allowed by them in the New Netherlands. But further efforts are to be made.

Meanwhile the Classis of Amsterdam is also agitating the matter. Their minutes of March 16, 1657, say: "Whereas the Lutherans in New Amsterdam are strengthening themselves and putting forth every effort to establish their position and form of worship, the Classis deems it in the highest degree necessary to watch against this thing, and earnestly to address the burgomasters of New Amsterdam and the West India Company, and to persuade them with all serious arguments, in order to check, at the beginning, this toleration of all sorts of religions and especially of the Lutherans, lest God's Church come to suffer more and more injury as time goes on."

Whilst the West India Company still withholds its permission to the settling of a Lutheran minister in the New Netherlands, it informs Stuyvesant under date of April 7: "We have by no means the intention to grant to the Lutherans any more liberty regarding the exercise of their religion than stated in our letter of June 14, by which we still stand," and this was, that the Lutherans "have free religious exercise in their houses."

The Classis of Amsterdam was not only zealous in preventing the sending of a Lutheran pastor to America, it also endeavored to have the Swedish Lutheran pastor on the Delaware, Lars Lock, expelled, but without success. "The burgomasters in particular showed hesitation in expelling the minister, whom the Lutherans had there." *Minutes*, April 10, 1657.

Though formal consent to the sending of a minister to the New Netherlands had not been secured as yet from the West India Company, still, on April 2, 1657, the Consistory ex-

tended a call to the Rev. John Ernestus Goetwasser, who, after prayerfully considering the matter for a week, accepted the same.

Goetwasser had scarcely reached this side of the Atlantic, before a letter is addressed by the Classis of Amsterdam to the Reformed Church in the New Netherlands, in which they say: "We have zealously watched the movement of the Lutherans, and upon the passenger lists the name of a certain John Ernest Goetwasser has been discovered, whom the Lutherans here ordained and sent over to Manhattan to minister to their coreligionists there. This will most signally hinder the truth. We have been occupied since last year in seeking to stop this evil. We have diligently plied the Directors and have persevered in our efforts, until they informed us that they had resolved to abide by the old resolution, which is: that the Lutherans be permitted the free exercise of their religion in their own houses. We cannot interpret this in any other way than that every one must have the freedom to serve God quietly in his own dwelling without any public gatherings or conventicles. When this interpretation is recognized, our complaints will cease."

Early in Aug., 1657, Goetwasser arrived at Manhattan. He writes under date of Aug. 16, to the Consistory at Amsterdam: "I report to you my safe arrival. The authorities hinder us in the exercise of our religion. They issue edicts in great numbers, forbidding us to hold meetings, and have gone as far as imposing a fine upon those who attend the private as well as the public meetings. They try very hard to frighten the congregation. At a meeting with the Governor and the Councillors I found no one inclined to listen to reason. The Governor handed me a set of rules, according to which we must regulate our affairs. The principal reason for the hatred manifested towards us is, that they might by and by gain for their church the children they have baptized in Lutheran families. They also fear

that they will lose some of those of our people who now attend their services." He again urges them to make another effort to secure full religious liberty for the Lutherans and not only for the holding of services in their own homes. "Such an effort must be successful," he continues, and concludes with these words, which, in the light of what happened seven years later, sound like prophecy: "Should the worst happen, the States might have to give our doctrine a hearing at the instance of a higher potentate." In 1664 the English took the New Netherlands and gave the Lutherans full religious liberty.

Immediately after the arrival of Goetwasser the two Reformed pastors sent a remonstrance to the Burgomasters and Schepens of the City of New Amsterdam, stating that they have understood a Lutheran minister had made his arrival with the intention of settling here. "This must operate injuriously to the policy of the government as well as to our Reformed religion, as the Lutherans had been forbidden to hold their separate conventicles"—a statement not in strict accordance with the facts. They insist that Goetwasser be returned to Holland in the same vessel in which he came. Goetwasser protests. He says that he had exhibited his passport from the West India Company, and had received permission from the Director to remain here as a free student. He had also deported himself in such a way that no one could charge him with disobedience. But his pleadings were in vain. He was ordered to depart, and forbidden to hold any services in the houses of the Lutherans. When the authorities became too troublesome, he was taken, by some members of the congregation into the country and for some months secreted. But at length the Governor had him arrested and deported.

The story of the treatment of the Lutherans in the New Netherlands is important to the student of Church History from more than one viewpoint:—We ask:

I. Did the Lutherans furnish any just cause or occasion to make them appear obnoxious and dangerous to the government of the New Netherlands? Did they, like Roger Williams in Massachusetts, preach the apostacy of the established Church? Did they teach that it is a sin to live under the charter of the West India Company? Or were they defiant in their attitude towards the courts and the established Church? Did they preach Antinomianism; or assume an indecorous attitude during divine service, and disturb public worship, or were they guilty of other acts which no civilized state can tolerate? What are the facts? We find that in all the petitions of the Lutheran congregation and of Goetwasser for permission to hold religious services they plead their past obedience to the laws of the colony, and their adversaries nowhere charge them with any of the offences just alluded to.

II. What reason then did Stuyvesant and his dominies assign for their treatment of the Lutherans? There is but one reason assigned by the Governor and his pastors, to wit: many of the Lutherans attend our church services, and some have even become communicants in our congregation; if we do not permit them to hold religious services of their own, more will come over and strengthen our church. But this position was as shortsighted as when in Virginia all non-conformists were expelled.

III. This intolerant spirit was happily not found in all the colonies, not even in those days, which was, indeed, a rude age. We have at least two notable exceptions, and they are: New Sweden, colonized by the Lutherans in 1637; and the colony of William Penn. History knows of no religious persecutions in these colonies.

IV. The effect of these measures upon the colonies themselves was not beneficial, as they had anticipated, but harmful. After the expulsion of the dissenters from Virginia, both the churches and the ministry degenerated and much worldliness crept in. And in the New Netherlands the

support of the established Church diminished to such a degree, that the directors of the West India Company called the Governor to account because of the neglect to pay in full the salaries of the pastors of the church on Manhattan. Indifference, if nothing worse, seemed to prevail among the church members.

V. Whilst those who persecuted the Lutherans did not profit by it, the loss in membership to this church was heavy. The 150 families of 1652 had been reduced in 1695 to 43, 30 of whom resided on Manhattan. No doubt some had connected themselves with the Dutch Reformed Church, whilst more had become indifferent to the Church, or removed from the colony.

VI. We have seen that the confessional basis of the Dutch Lutherans was the unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith as it had been delivered to the Emperor in 1530. The early German Lutheran settlers, as a rule, included in their doctrinal basis all the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. This shows that the Lutheran Church in this country was established upon a basis strictly in accord with the Confessions of the Church. This is important in view of later developments.

Let me add in conclusion, though it does not belong strictly to the subject of our paper, that whilst the period of transition from German to English inflicted another severe loss on the Lutheran Church, when at the beginning of the last century two Protestant Episcopal churches were organized out of material from the Lutheran Church, one congregation going over bodily, it is likewise true, that during the fifty years last past no protestant church has made such progress on Manhattan and in Greater New York as the Lutheran Church. Where in 1858 there were 7 Lutheran churches on Manhattan with about 4000 communicant members, there are now 38 churches with 19,614 communicant members, an increase of 444% in churches and of 390% in communicants. In Greater New York

The First Lutherans on Manhattan Island 101

the increase has been even larger. The 16 Lutheran churches of 1858 have, after 50 years, grown to 140, or at the rate of 775%; whilst the 7300 communicants of 1858 have increased to 52,697, or 621%.

Early Attempts at Church Union in America

By

James Isaac Good

EARLY ATTEMPTS AT CHURCH UNION IN AMERICA

BY JAMES ISAAC GOOD, PROFESSOR OF REFORMED CHURCH
HISTORY, CENTRAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
DAYTON, OHIO

(Read December 29, 1908)

THE eighteenth century was noted rather for the rise of new denominations than the union of old ones. Nevertheless it is not to be forgotten that attempts at union were made even though they were unsuccessful. It has taken nearly two hundred years for us in America to work out a plan of federation such as was attempted at Philadelphia in the early part of December, 1908. Federal Union was unknown, unthought of, in those early days. Organic union was the kind most generally considered. And this greatly increased the difficulties of forming church unions, as denominations were not generally willing to give up their peculiarities or their independence. I wish to speak of two efforts at church union especially connected with my own church, the German Reformed Church, leaving it for others to speak of other efforts that may have been made in the early history of America. In this age when church union is in the air it is certainly not unsuitable to study these early movements.

The first attempt at church union to which I shall refer was the attempt made by Count Zinzendorf in 1742 to unite all the German denominations and sects in Pennsylvania into a union of which the Moravians would be the leading

factor. It was a magnificent dream of this idealistic Christian, but the time was not yet ripe for it. It was based on the Moravian idea of "tropes" or circles of believers. The idea of the trope they drew from Philippians i., 18, where "tropos" (trope) is translated by "way." Their idea of tropes was that members of other denominations could remain in their denominations but could form circles that were in connection with the Moravians. Thus at Geneva in Switzerland the Moravians founded a trope in the Reformed Church, which afterwards, however, withdrew to form a Moravian church. With this idea Count Zinzendorf attempted to organize the German denominations and sects of Pennsylvania. He could the more easily do this with the Lutherans and the Reformed: for he claimed to be a Lutheran, as he adhered to the Augsburg Confession, which the Moravians had adopted we believe; and also he had been ordained by a Reformed chaplain of the court of Prussia, Jablonsky, who was also a bishop of the Moravian Church. And then, too, his plan of tropes was in harmony with a peculiarity of the German Reformed, especially along the upper Rhine, the *ecclesiola in ecclesiâ*, the little church of believing, earnest Christians in the midst of the large state congregation. After Zinzendorf's arrival in America, Henry Antes, the prominent Reformed elder of Pennsylvania, issued a circular, Dec. 15, 1741 (O. S.), calling for a conference of the various bodies on Jan. 1, 1742 (O. S.), at Germantown. Most of the German bodies were represented at this conference, Lutherans, Reformed, Mennonites, Dunkards, Schwenckfelders, Moravians, Mystics, and Separatists. Only one sect sent regularly accredited delegates, the Seventh-Day Dunkards of Ephrata. There were 36 members of the conference, but more were present, some out of curiosity. The published minutes reveal harmony in these conferences, but the report given by Fresenius tells of important differences in them and of some strife at times.

A second conference was held at Falkner Swamp, January 14 and 15, 1742 (O. S.). It was a smaller conference, to which only the Seventh-Day Dunkards sent delegates, the rest, as before, coming in their individual capacity. The third conference met at Oley, Feb. 10-12, 1742 (O. S.). Here the Seventh-Day Dunkards were not present. They however instead sent two letters on the subject of marriage. They withdrew from the conference because they evidently felt they could not gain the others to their peculiar notions of celibacy, the Lord's day, and immersion. But while they withdrew it is evident that the elements of the conference that remained were becoming more closely welded together, for the conference appointed four trustees. Also at this conference, for the first time a Quaker, a lady who made an address, was present, thus adding another sect. A remarkable event of this conference was the baptism of three Indians, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the first fruits of the Moravian work among the aborigines and the forerunner of many more trophies of that missionary church. After the Moravian fashion, they were baptized into "the wounds of Jesus." The fourth conference met at Germantown, March 10-12, 1742 (O. S.). It was a small conference of only twelve members present. The fifth conference was an important one, for it gave to this "Church of God in the Spirit," as the movement was now called, a creed. It was held at Germantown, April 6. This creed was a catechism based on the Bern articles of 1532, and was popularly named after Bechtel, the Reformed pastor of Germantown, who had joined this movement. But it was prepared by Zinzendorf. It contained 243 questions and was printed in German, English, and Swedish. Bechtel was ordained at this conference by Nitschman of the Moravian Church, he previously having had no ordination, having been by trade a turner. He was appointed, by this conference, inspector of the German Reformed churches of Pennsylvania. Another interesting feature of this conference was the appearance of

a Moravian missionary, Israel, from St. Croix, West Indies. The sixth conference was held at Germantown, May 5-7, 1742. As the last conference had attempted to organize the Reformed in the union movement, this attempted to do the same for the Lutherans by the composition of a Lutheran Catechism and Constitution. The seventh conference was held at Philadelphia, June 2-3, 1742. But the union movement was waning, and what was left of it was consolidating with the Moravians.

Just at this critical moment a fortunate event occurred for the Moravians,—the arrival at Philadelphia of a shipload of 120 Moravian emigrants destined for the new Moravian settlement at Bethlehem, Pa. This colony joined the conference, which made it a larger body than any previous conference, and their presence completed the Moravian supremacy in the movement. A half year later, Count Zinzendorf sailed for Europe, Jan. 9, 1743. The scattered elements of this union continued for some years to work together under the control of the Moravians at Bethlehem. Several meetings were held of the Reformed and Lutheran tropes. Thus there are minutes of a Reformed trope being held as late as Aug. 12, 1746, at Philadelphia. Some Reformed, as Bechtel, Rauch, Brandmiller (and Lischy for a while), went into the movement as ministers. But two Reformed ministers strongly opposed the movement—Boehm the founder of the German Reformed Church in this country, and Guldin who had himself been a pietist and had been driven out of Bern, Switzerland, for his pietism. The coming of Muhlenberg to organize the Lutheran Church, and of Schlatter to organize the Reformed into a sort of synod (called a coetus) in 1747, completed the failure of the movement. They gathered the Lutherans and Reformed into their respective denominations. The Moravians gathered into their number those favorable to the union, and the various churches and sects each went its own way. So began and ended the first effort at union. Looked at from

this distance, after the subject of union has been developed into almost a science, it might be called a co-operative sort of organic union, as it had elements of both, and yet was not a complete organic union until its elements coalesced ultimately in the Moravians.

The second attempt at church union was of a different sort. Here the attempt was not between bodies so widely different as the Seventh-Day Dunkards and Reformed, and as the Schwenckfelders and the Lutherans. It was not a sentimental attempt like Zinzendorf's, but an ecclesiastical. It was an attempt to unite churches that were closely allied. It was no less an attempt than to unite all the Calvinistic churches of the presbyterial order in America, Dutch, Scotch, and German. Had it been carried out, these three denominations would now be one body. An earlier attempt to unite two of the Calvinistic churches had been made on April 27, 1738, at New York between the Dutch and the German Reformed. It got as far as to draw up a constitution. This together with their minutes was sent to Holland for approval. But the Holland fathers with their usual Dutch slowness took so much time for its consideration that it never came to any result.

The beginning of this movement originated across the Atlantic Ocean in Holland. The Reformed Church of the Netherlands, that great missionary church of the seventeenth century, having missions in the far east and the far west, was in the eighteenth century still supporting many Reformed churches in different parts of the world. Was there a poor persecuted Reformed church anywhere—they appealed to Holland and generally got relief. The German Reformed Church of Pennsylvania, in their destitution, thus came in connection with the Reformed Church of the Netherlands from 1725 to 1792. The Reformed Church of the Netherlands had been trying at this time to get more information about the Reformed churches in Pennsylvania and had tried to send several ministers to superintend the Pennsylvania churches.

Nothing but Dutch patience and perseverance led them to continue trying to help these distant churches in the face of the difficulties that appeared. Finally, finding this so difficult, the deputies of the two synods of North and South Holland asked the Rev. P. H. Dorsius, a Dutch minister of Pennsylvania, who was then in Holland, whether the Dutch and German churches in Pennsylvania could not be united with the Presbyterian Church and thus the Church of the Netherlands be relieved of their expense and responsibility. They gave him two letters in September, 1743, one to the German congregations of Pennsylvania, urging them to unite. The other was to the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia. Dorsius came to America and laid the letter before the Presbyterian synod. On May 25, 1744, it took action and appointed a committee to write to the Church of the Netherlands, declaring their willingness to join the Calvinistic churches here. The committee consisted of the president of the synod, Rev. Mr. McHenry, and Revs. Andrews, Cross, and Evans, Jr. Mr. McHenry wrote June 14, 1744, to the Church of the Netherlands, and he also wrote to Rev. Mr. Kennedy, pastor of the Presbyterian church at Rotterdam in the Netherlands, who, as a Presbyterian, acted as a sort of intermediary between the deputies of the Netherlands Church and the Presbyterians of Philadelphia. Mr. McHenry's letter to the Holland synods was not received, for some reason, until April 28, 1745. The Dutch are proverbially slow. And the deputies, when they had received it, referred it to the synods. The synods, when they met that summer, simply referred the matter back to the deputies. Finally, on November 16, 1745, one of the deputies, Du Vignon, reported that he had had a long conference with Rev. Mr. Kennedy of Rotterdam, who thought there would be no trouble to bring about such a union in America.

But now difficulties began to appear. Denominations that are attempting to unite, as they get nearer together,

often get farther apart. In courting, whether personal or ecclesiastical, the course of true love never runs smooth. Difficulties began to appear on both sides of the Atlantic. The leading minister of the German Reformed, John Philip Boehm, refused to go into the union for five reasons.

1. The Germans did not wish to give up their constitution, which had been adopted by a number of congregations.

2. They did not understand English, and so a union would be useless.

3. They did not want to give up their creed, the Heidelberg Catechism.

4. They were not willing to give up the Canons of Dort to which the congregations had been pledged.

5. They did not wish to give up the use of liturgical forms as at the sacraments and marriage, for among the Presbyterians all the services were free.

On some of these points, we believe, Boehm was too strenuous, and some he did not understand. Still we must not find too much fault with him. Church union was as yet a new science and existed then only in germ. To-day the question of language would be no hindrance, as the Presbyterians have a good many German congregations. And the Presbyterians to-day allow the use of the Heidelberg Catechism and the use of the liturgical forms if desired. Boehm's fears were not justified, but he reflected the spirit of his day.

Another difficulty appeared from the Dutch ministers in New York City. They were strongly Calvinistic and predestinarian. They looked with suspicion on the tendency, to what they, as Calvinists, supposed to be heterodoxy, on the part of the wing of the Presbyterians who followed Whitefield and were New-Measure men. However, this was not necessary, as the synod of Philadelphia was composed of conservative churchly Presbyterian, and not of the Whitefield, elements. Still they were suspicious and that suspicion made them halt.

112 Early Attempts at Church Union in America

Another difficulty began to arise on the other side of the Atlantic. The synods of the Netherlands heard of the opposition of the Dutch ministers in New York and they referred the matter to the deputies for more information. When the Presbyterians in Pennsylvania heard of this, they felt themselves quite aggrieved that suspicion should be roused against their Calvinistic orthodoxy. One of their ministers, Rev. Mr. Cross, of Philadelphia, wrote October 16, 1746, to Rev. Mr. Kennedy of Rotterdam, defending the Presbyterian Synod of America against the charges. Notwithstanding this letter, all further attempts to unite these churches seem to have ceased. And thus the first attempt at union, 1744-46, ended.

But the matter was not permitted to rest entirely. In 1750 it came up again. At that time the Church of the Netherlands had an unfortunate church case on their hands, a church-quarrel in the German church at Philadelphia between the Schlatter and the Steiner parties. They felt themselves too far away to properly deal with the difficult case. And it occurred to them that the Presbyterian Church of America would be able to look after it better than they, as it was on the ground. Churches like individuals like to get out of difficulties by transferring them to the shoulders of others. So the deputies asked the South Holland synod about reviving the subject of union. The classis of Leyden seconded this and the South Holland synod approved it. The North Holland synod expressed itself pleased with it, but referred it to the deputies for more information. In 1751, four of the classes overtured the South Holland synod in favor of such a union. That synod urged Rev. Mr. Schlatter, now the leader of the German Reformed Church, to bring about such a union. He, in a letter dated May, 1751, expresses himself favorably to it, but says the ignorance of the Germans and their obstinacy and their misgivings prevent it, as they looked upon it as a change of religion. It is to be remembered that many of

the Germans had come to this country for liberty of conscience, and they were jealous on that point and would not be easily coerced. But again opposition arose. In the North Holland synod it was said that the Presbyterian Church of Pennsylvania was not the same as the Presbyterian Church of Scotland with which the Dutch were in correspondence. It was said that the Presbyterians in America were an independent denomination, without creed or church government or liturgy. (They seem to have confused them with the Congregationalists.) It therefore declined to enter into the union. This was followed the next year by a similar action by the South Holland synod.

So failed all efforts at church union, and Calvinists—Dutch, Scotch, and German—remained separated. Rev. Dr. Briggs, in his *American Presbyterianism*, page 244, lays the blame of this failure on the Old School or Conservative Presbyterians, who forced out the Whitefieldians, and thus caused a division of Presbyterians about that time which prevented this union of Calvinists. But Dr. Briggs did not have at hand the Holland correspondence first published in 1896. There it is evident that the failure was due to the suspicions of the Dutch ministers of New York and of the Netherlands Church about the Whitefieldians. So it was not the Old School Calvinists, but the New School who prevented the union.

Dr. Briggs suggests (page 288) that its failure caused the Presbyterians in America to forfeit their peculiar supremacy on this continent. We are not quite ready to go as far as that. But there is no doubt that the union would have greatly solidified and aided the Presbyterian elements here, over against any attempts by the Episcopacy to become a state church in the colonies. As it was, the American Revolution has an ecclesiastical aspect. It was caused by the Calvinists. It was the Baptists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians of various phases united together against royalty. The only denomination not Calvinistic, that in the

main was favorable to independence, was the Lutheran. But the Episcopalians and Methodists stood by the king. Had this union of which we speak occurred, it would still further have strengthened the hand of the Calvinists politically at that time. And we believe Calvinism in America would have been stronger to-day.

In conclusion permit me to remark that this study of early attempts at church unions is interesting because it reveals the church was like a child, learning to creep, before it can walk, on so great a subject as church union. Since that time different forms of church union have appeared, Cooperation, Federation, Fusion. (Cesar Malan used to have a sort of proverb which he liked to quote: "Fusion—confusion; union—communion." He separated fusion and union, which are now looked upon as the same.) But since those early days not merely have these general forms of union appeared, but also many shades of each of them. And the whole subject has been analyzed and synthesized until now we have attempted unions of all kinds—federations such as the Great Federation which met in Philadelphia in 1908; organic union such as between the Northern and Cumberland Presbyterians. And now an organic union with a federal appendage is suggested between the Presbyterians and the German Reformed, although it is too early to speak of it yet. Let the work go on. Church union is a great problem viewed from the historian's standpoint. Any advance is a great gain. The twentieth century will work out new phases of it as did the nineteenth. In all these movements we can see the hand of God manifest, who is leading the Church whither He will.

Early Ministerial Training in America

By

Samuel Simpson

EARLY MINISTERIAL TRAINING IN AMERICA

BY SAMUEL SIMPSON, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN
CHURCH HISTORY, HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

(Read December 29, 1908)

WHAT is contemplated in this paper is a general rather than a careful or exhaustive treatment of the subject named,—a rapid survey, we may say, of the nature and extent of ministerial training in America prior to the establishment of our present theological schools.

Virginia, the first of the English colonies, owing to the general instability of her early settlers, was but feebly interested in intellectual concerns, and, as a consequence, had little actual share in the development of the early educational history of our country. In like manner, the quality of the early Dutch inhabitants of the island of Manhattan and the nature of their occupation and environment were distinctly unfavorable to the speedy establishment and successful maintenance of schools.

The various conditions which thus operated to the discouragement of educational interest and progress in the colonies named were notably absent in the case of New England, particularly so in the case of Massachusetts Bay. In striking contrast with the motley, indigent crowd of fortune-seekers who first landed on the shores of Virginia, and the more worthy but hardly less sordid fur-traders of Manhattan, stand the first Puritan immigrants to Massachusetts. Born to the social and educational advantages belonging to the

homes of the moderately wealthy class of English society, they were in point of moral and intellectual worth the best that England at that day had to offer to the world. Moreover, their coming to America was not prompted by any hope of personal gain, whether from mines or from peltries advantageously acquired of the unsophisticated sons of the forest. Their coming was to escape the governmental restrictions and oppressions of their native land. This step was taken with the full consciousness and expectation that they would never return. They came to America not for a few years' trade and adventure, but with a settled purpose of making it their permanent abiding-place. Thus there was from the beginning such a union of conditions and incentives as tended naturally to make them pioneers in all undertakings that had as their aim the intellectual and spiritual betterment of society. While they accepted uncomplainingly and as a simple matter of course the physical limitations and discomforts of their lot, they manifested from the first a resolute unwillingness to submit to such deprivations as would entail mental and spiritual loss.

The interest manifested by the early settlers of Massachusetts in the subject of education is precisely what was to be expected in view of the character and antecedents of their leading men. Of those who came over in the first shiploads to Massachusetts Bay, a goodly proportion were graduates of English universities. Never in the history of the country, in fact, has the educational average of any given community exceeded that of Massachusetts for the first half century after its settlement. It is estimated that in 1638 the colonial settlements of Massachusetts and Connecticut contained a total of not less than fifty who had completed courses at Cambridge and Oxford, or one university graduate to every 250 of the population. (Dexter, *History of Education in the United States*, p. 223.) From this it would appear that the proportion of university-bred men to the total number of inhabitants was considerably greater than

it is with us to-day. Foremost among this university contingent were the clergymen, including among their number John Wilson, John Eliot, John Cotton, Thomas Hooker, John Norton, Thomas Shepard, John Davenport, Charles Chauncey, Richard Mather, and many others. The majority of these had received their education at Cambridge. Some three or four were from Oxford. The difference between Cambridge and Oxford at this time, as respects curriculum and methods of instruction, was slight. Within both, however, there had grown up a distinctive type of thought, the result mainly of the peculiar traditions of each. Oxford's attitude toward the new doctrinal ideas of the Reformation was less friendly than that of Cambridge. At the latter institution the new liberalism had early attained a firm foothold. With the return of the Marian exiles, on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Cambridge became the great centre of Calvinistic influence in England—an influence which in the modified form of Puritanism was the ruling one in Emmanuel College from its very founding in 1583. And it was Emmanuel College which furnished the largest quota of university recruits for the Bay Colony. This fact deserves mention for the reason that the admiration and affection of these old worthies for their English *alma mater* had much to do, doubtless, in prompting them to provide for the intellectual needs of the colony, as well as in determining the type of institution they were to establish.

If we take into consideration, then, the character and attainments of the founders of Massachusetts, we are not surprised to find from the Colonial Records that scarcely were they well established in their log shelters ere steps were taken to provide for the educational needs of the community. Moreover, it is perfectly consonant with these facts and with all that we know concerning the aims and ideals of these men, as well as with the express declarations contained in the records of those times, that the principal

motive in the founding of Harvard College was the production of an adequate supply of suitably trained ministers. In the case of Yale College, founded more than half a century later, this is expressly and severally declared to be the motive of its founding by its early presidents, the corporation, and the General Assembly of the Colony. At the same time, it would be a serious injustice to suppose from what has been said that these men of the first generation were men so mentally circumscribed as to believe that the function of higher education began and ended in the training of Christian ministers. An act of the Massachusetts General Court, passed in 1652, throws an interesting light not only upon what the schools had accomplished, but upon what they were expected to accomplish. We learn from the wording of this act that the number of students in the College was increasing. For the time being the supply of learned men for "magistrates, associates in Courts, physicians, and officers of the Commonwealth, and of teaching elders in the churches" was sufficient, but the young men after completing their education were wont to "seek for and accept employment" elsewhere; and, as a result, it was "becoming more and more difficult to fill places of most eminence as they are empty or wanting." "If timely provision be not made, it will tend much to the disparagement, if not to the ruin, of the Commonwealth." (Dexter, p. 36, *Mass. Col. Rec.*, vi., pt. 1, p. 100.)

It is clear from this that our Massachusetts forefathers had no such narrow conception of the office of the higher education as would confine it merely to the work of providing a learned ministry. We correctly represent their attitude of mind when we say that religion was to them the one thing of primary importance, and that they regarded its proper fostering and safeguarding their first duty. As non-conformist members of the Church of England, their sturdy religious scruples made exile from the mother country an easy alternative as compared with the

acceptance of an order of things which involved compromise of conscience.

It was with reference first of all to the suitable training of ministers that the courses of study at Harvard were arranged; from which it follows naturally that Harvard College at the time of its founding, and for many years thereafter, was in aim and essence more a theological seminary than a college of liberal arts. Not that young men contemplating secular callings were unwelcome. They were cordially admitted to its privileges, as is shown by the fact that while five of the first graduating class of 1642 were destined for the ministry, four were looking forward to secular pursuits. At the same time it is well, in comparing the educational standards of that day with our own, to remember that then as now theories of state fundamentally affected theories of education. What more natural in a semi-theocratic government, with church and clergy exercising a dominating influence in public affairs, with the Bible accepted not only as the infallible norm of faith and conduct, but also as the guide of legal procedure and a text-book on civil government—what more natural than the conclusion of our Puritan forefathers, that the kind of education required to equip a man for the work of the Christian ministry was likewise the best possible as a preparation for usefulness in the state.

A knowledge of what constituted for substance the ministerial education of this early period can be obtained best by a reference to the four years' course of study at Harvard.

Exact and authentic information as to the courses of instruction at Harvard from its founding to the end of that century is somewhat meagre. Quincy in his *History of Harvard* (i., pp. 190-191) says that "so much Latin as was sufficient to understand Tully, or any like classical author, and to make and speak true Latin, in prose and verse, and so much Greek as was included in declining perfectly

the paradigms of the Greek nouns and verbs, were the chief if not the only requisites for admission. The exercises of the students had the aspect of a theological rather than a literary institution. They were practised twice a day in reading the Scriptures, giving an account of their proficiency and experience in practical and spiritual truths, accompanied by theoretical observations on the language and logic of the sacred writings. They were carefully to attend to God's ordinances, and be examined on their profiting, commonplacing the sermons and repeating them publicly in the hall. The studies of the first year were logic, physics, etymology, syntax, and practice on principles of grammar; those of the second year, ethics, politics, prosody, and dialectics, practice of poesy, and Chaldee; those of the third, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, exercises in style, composition, Hebrew and Syriac."

"In every year and every week of the college course, every class was practised in the Bible and catechetical divinity; also in history in the winter, and in the nature of plants in the summer. Rhetoric was taught by lectures in every year, and each student was required to declaim once a month . . . Such substantially was the course at Harvard during the whole of the seventeenth century." (Peirce, pp. 96-99.)

In 1721, at the solicitation of President Leverett, Thomas Hollis, a merchant of London, and a Baptist, contributed the funds necessary for the founding of a Professorship of Divinity. About forty years later (1764) was founded the Hancock Professorship of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages. (*Ibid.*, p. 100.)

As already observed, Hebrew and the other original languages of the Bible were taught in Harvard from the beginning; but it was not till 1722 that a separate instructor, in the person of Mr. Judah Monis, a Jewish Rabbi, was appointed to teach Hebrew. All the undergraduates except freshmen and such others as should be exempted by the

President and tutors were required to attend his instruction four days in the week. By 1755 it would appear that the college authorities had experienced a change of heart as to the importance of Hebrew in the general curriculum, for instruction in that subject was reduced to one afternoon a week and attendance was made optional. (Peirce, p. 233.)

In this recital it should be borne in mind that Harvard, so far as the course of study was concerned, simply adopted the contemporaneous practice of the English universities, and that the same was true of Yale, the only difference being that Yale naturally copied the example of her older sister institution. Besides the drill in logic and syllogistic disputation, there were required at Yale formal recitations in dogmatic theology. Joannes Wollebius' *Compendium Theologicæ Christianiæ* was the text-book used. It was a little book of 266 pages, in Latin, a sort of amplified Shorter Catechism, and the favorite theological text-book of that day. This passing glimpse at the early curricula of Harvard and Yale is sufficient to disclose how pitifully meagre, with the possible exception of logic, was the course of study in all branches of learning.

The year 1755 saw the appointment of a Professor of Divinity at Yale, an event so important as to mark the beginning of a new era of theological instruction in that institution. The doctrinal strife and controversy which followed the Great Revival proved a ruthless disturber of the peace at New Haven. A division of opinion arose in regard to the nature of the preaching at the First Church—the church which the students attended. The result of the division was the establishment of separate worship for the students within college walls, and the appointment, as has been said, of a Professor of Divinity, who was to be at the same time college pastor and preacher. To the Professor of Divinity were intrusted the general care and instruction of students preparing for the ministry.

The appointment of the first Professor of Divinity marks the beginning at Yale of the regular instruction of graduate classes in theology. Professor Kingsley remarks that "from the establishment of the Professorship of Divinity, and probably from a much earlier time, there had been generally at the College a class of resident graduates who were pursuing the study of theology." ("Sketch of the History of Yale College," *Quart. Reg.*, 1836.) He adds that their number varied considerably in different years. It was a part of the recognized function of this professor to aid and instruct theological students in their professional studies. Sunday afternoons he delivered a course of sermons on doctrinal theology. These sermons were intended for the whole student body, but were thought to be of especial value to those who were looking forward to the ministry. In addition to the Sunday sermons he gave a course of lectures, one each week, on some theological topic. An old statute of 1795 defines the duty of the Professor of Divinity in the following words: "To give from time to time such lectures and private instructions to the resident graduates and students as he shall judge may best preserve and promote the religious interests of the College and tend most effectually to form for future usefulness in the work of the evangelical ministry such of the students as shall appear desirous of being prepared for it." Of those who served as Divinity Professor at Yale none fulfilled the duties of the office with a greater degree of success than President Dwight, who numbered among his pupils such future leaders of religious thought as Moses Stuart, Lyman Beecher, and Nathaniel William Taylor. With the death of Dr. Dwight we find ourselves on the verge of a new epoch in theological education, that of the organization of distinct departments and separate schools of theology.

When a young man had completed the course of study we have thus somewhat vaguely outlined, he had received in substance his education for the Christian ministry.

It is not to be inferred, however, that the recent graduate took upon himself at once the active duties of a parish. In the absence of other reasons, he was not infrequently too youthful for that. As a rule, several years of waiting must intervene before such a step would be deemed advisable. This interval the candidate was supposed to spend in further study. This he usually did, but, as we shall see, his studies were of a rather desultory sort.

The influence of English university example and tradition is clearly seen in the use that was made of these waiting years. In the early days at Harvard, graduates were encouraged to tarry in the pursuit of special studies, availing themselves of the use of the library, and of the help and suggestions to be received from the president and his teaching associates.

The custom which presently arose of appointing as fellows and tutors certain of the ablest graduates was one which tended to render the practice of tarrying at the College all the more attractive, inasmuch as it led to the creation of a little coterie of choice spirits in whose society it was good to dwell. The early records of Harvard bear witness not only to the prevalence of this custom, they also make it clear that the lingering graduate was reckoned as no mere outsider, but as a real member of the College. His accommodations as to board and room were the same as those enjoyed by the rank and file of the student body. (Sibley's *Harvard Graduates*, pp. 172, 173, 212, 222.) This was a common custom at Harvard for upwards of a century. At Yale the case was not different. Jonathan Edwards on graduation in 1720 remained two years at the College in the pursuit of theological studies.

It was toward the middle of the 18th century that it became a regularly established custom for ministerial candidates to reside in the families of ministers for the purpose of studying under their special direction. This practice came about gradually. The first New England pastor to

accept ministerial candidates in considerable numbers into his home for purposes of instruction and training was Dr. Joseph Bellamy, of Bethlehem, Conn. (a parish in the town of Woodbury). As shedding light on Bellamy's methods of instruction I can do no better than quote a paragraph from Sprague's *Annals* (p. 405-406). "From the time that Mr. Bellamy resumed the stated charge of his flock at the close of his labors as an itinerant, he commenced assisting young men in their theological studies preparatory to the ministry. . . . Many of the most eminent ministers of New England of the last generation were trained in a great measure under his instructions. It was his custom to furnish his pupils with a set of questions covering the whole field of theology, and then to give them a list of books corresponding to the several subjects which they were to investigate; and in the progress of their inquiries he was accustomed almost daily to examine them, to meet whatever difficulties they might have found, and to put himself in the attitude of an objector with a view at once to extend their knowledge and increase their intellectual acumen. When they had gone through the prescribed course of reading, he required them to write dissertations on the several subjects which had occupied their attention; and afterwards sermons on those points of doctrine which he deemed most important; and, finally, sermons on such experimental and practical topics as they might choose to select. He was particularly earnest in inculcating the importance of a high tone of spiritual feeling as an element of ministerial character and success." This paragraph is illuminative as it sets forth substantially the methods employed by all ministers engaged in the work of private theological instruction. Confirmation of this and of the general and desultory character of the candidate's reading may be gathered from a perusal of the Diary of Rev. Thomas Robbins, who was a private pupil of the Rev. Stephen West, of Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

To the home of Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Northamp-

ton, Mass., resorted not a few, among them, Samuel Hopkins, who, in turn, while pastor at Newport, became quite famous as a theological instructor.

In process of time a goodly number of ministers who had received their training in the homes of these famous leaders became in turn the instructors, under like conditions, of a new generation of students. Among those who had studied under Bellamy and afterward received pupils under their care were the Rev. Levi Hart of Preston (Griswold), Conn., Dr. John Smalley, of New Britain, Dr. Samuel Spring, of Newburyport, and Dr. Ephraim Judson, of Sheffield, Mass. Of these, Drs. Hart and Smalley appear to have been resorted to more than the others.

It should be said that despite the number and popularity of these private theological schools, the earlier practice of making divinity a subject of post-graduate study had by no means ceased. Some of the most distinguished ministers of the latter half of the 18th century obtained their theological training at Yale and in much the same way as Jonathan Edwards had received his about fifty years earlier.

These men were Dr. Nathan Strong, who became minister of the First Church of Hartford, Dr. Timothy Dwight, later President of the College, Dr. Joseph Lyman, pastor at Hatfield, Mass., and Dr. Joseph Buckminster, of Portsmouth, N. H. All graduated about the same time, all became tutors in the College, and were meanwhile carrying on theological study assisted by each other and by the President.

It might be well to add here that the methods of theological instruction we have sought to describe as belonging to Harvard and Yale were employed also in the New England colleges founded somewhat later—Dartmouth, Williams, Bowdoin, and Brown.

As the 18th century drew to a close, and the population increased, there was a corresponding increase in the number of private theological schools. The service which Dr. Bellamy had rendered to a prior generation was now discharged

with equal efficiency and popularity by Dr. Nathaniel Emmons, of Franklin, Mass. During Dr. Emmons's long ministry he is believed to have been the instructor of about one hundred candidates (Dr. Park's Memoir in Sprague). Next to Emmons in the number of his students was Dr. Asa Burton, of Thetford, Vt. Dr. Charles Backus, of Somers, Conn., whose active ministry covered about twenty-five years, was the instructor of nearly fifty students, and among them were several who as ministers and educators attained great eminence.

This discussion has been confined necessarily to early ministerial training as it obtained among the Congregationalists of New England. In the Presbyterian Church, so far as the native trained portion of its ministry was concerned, methods and conditions were essentially the same. What Bellamy, Emmons, and others, as theological instructors, were to Congregational New England, Tennent and Blair were to Presbyterian Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The service rendered by President Witherspoon of Princeton in training young men for the Presbyterian ministry is fairly comparable to the similar service rendered by Dr. Dwight at Yale. There was in the case of the Presbyterian Church a second step in the work of theological instruction as carried on privately in the homes of active pastors. In the Congregational Churches the dispensers of theological instruction were self-appointed and voluntarily sought out on the part of their pupils. This was true for a time in the case of the Presbyterian Church; but later the Church itself took a hand, to the extent of designating the pastors whom it considered fitted to furnish such instruction. A small stipend additional to their regular salary was paid those so designated, in recognition of their extra labor.

That the private theological school, as it existed some hundred or more years ago, had certain points of advantage over our modern system, is perhaps only fair to concede.

But that in other points, more important perhaps, it stood at an almost incalculable disadvantage is very plain. Time forbids even the briefest consideration of the relative merits of the old and the new way, a full discussion of which might more properly be made the subject of a separate paper.

Luther and Economic Questions

By

John Alfred Faulkner

LUTHER AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

BY JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY,
DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

(Read December 29, 1908)

THERE are two facts to be borne in mind in regard to Luther's whole attitude to social and economic questions. The first is that ordinarily this was a territory to be confined to experts, in which ministers should not meddle. He believed that a special knowledge was necessary to deal with some of these matters, and that they had better be left to those to whom Providence had assigned them, whether the jurists, those clever in worldly knowledge, or the authorities. The other fact is that the Church after all has social duties, and that Church and clergy must fight flagrant abuses and try to bring in the Kingdom of God on earth. The Church must use the Word of God against sin and sinners, and so by spiritual ministries help the needs of the time. The authorities on their part shall proceed by strict justice against evil doers. But there is another fact here which it is necessary to mention to get Luther's whole attitude, viz., that the State's function is not simply to administer justice, but to secure the general weal. They shall do the very best they can for their subjects, says Luther.¹ "The authorities shall serve their subjects and use their office not petulantly [nicht zu Mutwillen] but for the advancement of the common good, and especially for the poor."²

¹ *Erl. Ausg.* 23: 296; 24: 264.

² 38: 324.

The princes shall give laws which shall limit as far as possible social misery and national dangers. They should listen to the proposals of the Church to this end, and on the ground of wise counsels of churchmen, do away with old laws and make new ones. The Church does not have to make these laws or reform the secular life,—that can only be done by the State. But the Church uncovers social conditions, she shows dangers, she places aims before the State, she punishes and prays, and thus works upon the State. The latter takes up the matter, and by conscientious and strict use of her powers brings in a better order.¹ According to Luther, says Seeberg, the “Church has the holy task to fight against immorality, against poverty and misery. She does that inasmuch as she invokes every Christian, inasmuch as she forms organizations or the care of the suffering, and calls upon the State for effective interference. The work of the Inner Mission as well as the social work of the Church are inseparable from her nature, for she is entrusted with the task of preaching the Gospel.”²

Though Luther felt a certain reserve, and urged on preachers the same reserve, in treating questions which might be left to legal and other authorities, he at the same time did not hesitate to declare himself on various matters in the economic, social, or political field. Let us take some of these economic questions.

Luther had a healthy appreciation of work, and broke completely with the mediæval glorification of mendicancy. That was one of his chief services to mankind. “God has no use for the lazy, unfaithful idler, who does not do what he is commanded, but lets his hands and feet go.” “House-servant and house-maid should have joy in their hearts that they serve, as Christ himself calls them. For priests, monks, and nuns might rejoice if they were in the same

¹ Seeberg, *Luther's Stellung zu den sittl. u. sozialen Nöten s. Zeit* in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xii. (1901), 851.

² *Ibid.*, 852.

state. If you ask a house-maid why she washes the plates or milks the cow, she can say: I know that what I do pleases God, since I follow God's word and command. That is a high good and noble treasure, of which no one is worthy."¹ The work of hand-laborers is "pleasing and lovely; they live without care and without special encumbrance. For work strengthens the body and preserves health." The Roman Catholic dictum was: "Business which denies leisure is bad; only seek the true rest, which is God." Idleness may be better for the salvation of the soul than work, which is only valuable as a concession to the needs of life, while to remain poor is a divine call as well as to work. Begging and idleness were therefore two of the curses of mediæval life, as they are to-day in Roman Catholic lands. Eberlin of Gunzberg (about 1520) once answered the question why there was no money in the country by saying that only one in fifteen worked, the rest were idle. Luther had to complain over this Catholic inheritance, the natural results of this premium on idleness: "No one wants to work," he says; "therefore the landworkers must let their slaves or [servants, knechte] have plenty of holidays; then they are free and no one can control them. There is the greatest complaint over domestics and workmen, how disobedient, untrue, undisciplined, selfish they are; that is a plague from God."² On the other hand, Luther said: Work is divine; it is God's command; we cannot be too diligent; work belongs to human nature; as a bird to fly, so is a man born to work—there he finds his divine destination.³ The body is made to work, which keeps it healthy.⁴ But chiefly that we may serve our neighbor, and be useful in our day; the householder to his family, the slave to his lord, the prince in the fulfilment of his duties. Christ shall not ask whether you are a man or woman, emperor or stable-man, mayor or constable,—simply be obedient to God where you are and

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 51: 422. ² 20: 272 f.¹ ³ 5: 93; 20: 284; 4: 330; 13: 95, etc.

⁴ 4: 380, etc.

do not renounce your calling.¹ If you do not work so that you may support yourself and have to give to the needy, you are no Christian, but a thief and a robber.² With these words Luther broke the spell of the mediæval beggar saint. "Useless people, who serve neither to protect nor to nourish, but only consume, lounge around, or tramp, should not be suffered, but be driven out of the land or made to work."³ Roscher well says that in the matter of begging Luther is a turning-point to a higher social economy.⁴ His work here had the significance of a revolution.

Of different kinds of work, Luther esteemed agriculture best, healthiest, more religious, nearer to nature, nearer to God. He says that it is not money and goods which nourish men, but God alone, so that man's good does not stand in human wit, but in God's blessing.⁵ "Agriculture is a divine means of subsistence,—it comes straight down from heaven."⁶ "To cultivate the earth is a divine work, which God has commanded, according to Genesis i."⁷ Therefore the peasant's work is the happiest, and "full of hope, for to sow, to plow, to plant, to graft, to mow, to cut, to thresh,—all that has great hope."⁸ Therefore he thinks it would be better if there were fewer merchants and tradesmen and more farmers.⁹

But all other kinds of work have their place. The people form one body, and an overseer may be more useful than a hand-laborer. Then where would princes and nobles be if there were no ministers, teachers, farmers, artisans?

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 1: 250; 52: 112. See further in Ward, *Darstellung und Würdigung der Ansichten Luthers vom Staat u. seinen wirtschaftlichen Aufgaben*, Jena, 1898, 47 ff.

² *Erl. Ausg.*, 9: 319.

³ 22: 28; cf. 57: 358; 20: 286. See also Erhardt's putting of this side of Luther in his article on "The Economic Views of the Reformers" in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1880, H. 4, 677 ff.

⁴ *Geschichte der Nationalökonomik in Deutschland*, München, 1874, 68.

⁵ *Erl. Ausg.*, 57: 137. See Schmoller, *Zur Geschichte der nat. ökonom. Ansichten in Deutschland während der Reformationsperiod* in *Tübinger Zeitschrift* 1860, 474.

⁶ *Erl. Ausg.*, 57: 342.

⁷ 57: 248.

⁸ 61: 352-3.

⁹ 21: 375.

Division of labor is necessary. I have cloth, but I could not make hose. "Therefore it is well ordered in the Latin lands that the tailors have a special guild which make hose and nothing else; here they make hose, doublet [jacket], and coat, all in one form and in one feat."¹ The higher forms of labor are much esteemed by Luther. "Next to the preaching office, I know that the work of the teacher is the most useful, the greatest, and the best?"² Physicians are also useful, and the lawyers are specially valuable in the protection of life, property, and virtue. For the same reason the worldly authorities are to be prized. This will explain also Luther's appreciation of the soldier. "Ah, war is like a golden hook, with which if a man fishes he does not get very much."³ He frankly confesses that war is a great plague, but he adds: "We have also to see how much greater the plague from which war saves us."⁴ For this reason war is just as necessary in its place as eating or drinking. So far as war is a war of necessity, one can fight even as a mercenary soldier. A warrior must have a good conscience, and must be sure he is serving God. The calling of a soldier in itself is just as honorable as any.⁵ This does not mean that our Reformer was oblivious to the desolating influence of war. "May God turn away his wrath from us, for war is the greatest punishment, as it destroys religion and worldly and domestic rule. Everything goes under. Scarcity and pestilence are as a foxtail,—not to be compared to war."⁶ Business of a jailer and executioner is also necessary.⁷ It was Luther's glory to make divine the calling of the common man,—that the smith at his forge is as truly the servant of God and co-worker with Him as the monk at his prayers.

There were some businesses, however, which Luther did not like. One of these was the usurer's or interest taker's. I cannot go into the history of interest in the Christian Church. Suffice it to say that following the

¹ See Schmoller, 484 ff.

² *Erl. Ausg.*, 20: 40.

³ 62: 173.

⁴ 22: 249.

⁵ 22: 273, 279, 282, 284.

⁶ 62: 173.

22: 73.

unanimous opinion of the Fathers, the mediæval Church condemned all taking of interest, though she did not succeed in breaking up the practice even among her own members. In this matter Luther stood squarely with her, though Calvin did not. In the Middle Ages there was but little opportunity to lay out money productively, as there came to be with the new discoveries at the dawn of the modern era, and the great trade routes east and west. Before Luther's time the chief borrowers were the poor, and they borrowed not to start some money-making scheme but to live, to tide them over hard places. As long as husbandry was the chief business, and payments were made in kind, the taking of interest was really usury and exploitation of the poor. With the expansion of trade and the building up of great industries, a process which was going on rapidly in the sixteenth century, the situation changed; large monies were needed, and interest was charged as a matter of course. Luther inherited the old conception, and it is to the credit of his sense of justice and of mercy that he came out strongly against the practice. In three or four writings he struck it hard blows, in his long and in his short sermon on usury (or interest), in 1519,¹ in his book, *Von Kaufshandlung und Wucher*,² 1524, and in his appeal to the clergy, *An die Pfarrherrn wider den Wucher zu predigen*,³ 1540.

In the first book (1519) he says that the spirit of "avarice and interest [usury, Wucher] has not only mightily increased, but has understood how to seek a covering-board under which it, with the reputation of fairness, can carry on its evil. And so it has almost come about that we no longer regard the holy gospel. Therefore it is necessary in these dangerous times to show to every man how he can carry on business in temporal goods, making the right distinction, and carefully observing the holy Gospel of Christ our Lord." Notice

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 20: 89-122.

² 22: 199-226.

³ 23: 282-338. The second book (1524) has been translated by Professor Carruth of the University of Kansas in the *Open Court* (Chicago), January, 1897, 16-34 (vol. xi.).

the religious standpoint. He refers to Luke vi.: 30 *ff.* as the great charter of non-interest loaning. A poor man has to borrow. "You should loan and expect nothing from it. It is usury all the same when you loan wine, corn (korn, wheat and other grains), money or what-not to your neighbors for a year or a certain length of time; obligating or loading them with interest, that they must give back more or other than they have borrowed."¹ Such a proceeding is against love of the neighbor and against the natural law which Christ shows us in Luke vi.: 31 and Matt. vii.: 12. Against the objection that in non-interest loans a man loses the use of what he has loaned, he simply answers: "He who considers giving or loaning, must also have previously considered the interest, or he would neither give nor loan." Then when it is said that it is a custom for scholars, priests, Churches to loan for gain, Luther replies: "Well, it is neither Christian, nor godly, nor natural, and against this no example can help."²

The second part of the sermon he considers Zinskauf or Rentenkauf, the letting out of capital or goods for yearly return, or selling on credit with interest, or, as Erhardt explains it,³ a laying out of capital for interest upon real property (apparently the same as our mortgage), only with this difference from the present form of such loaning, that the creditor was looked upon as the legal possessor of the property, and had a claim upon a regular income either in kind or in money. This, Luther says, is a pretty way of loading other people without apparent sin, and becoming rich without any cost to oneself. In this case the debtor gives over to the creditor the use of some property, which he can claim again after he has paid what he owes; or it takes the form of a personal interest claim which is liquidated by the activity of the debtor in industry, art, or handwork. Sometimes it is a steady payment of interest in money. The time in which all these forms of Rentenkauf may run

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 20: 105.

² 20: 107.

³ Erhardt, 704.

is sometimes for life or for ever. There was much discussion of the permissibility of these forms of gain in the sixteenth century, and Church ordinances generally held them valid under certain conditions. Luther, however, had no patience with them. He thinks Rentenkauf increases only goods, the honor of men, and luxury gives occasion to avarice; for the creditor in these transactions "never or but seldom considers the advantage and help of the buyer, but only his own." Besides, this kind of selling for revenue is in its effect only usury or interest after all, and it brings all lands, cities, people under burdens, exhausts and destroys them.¹ "Selling on credit has brought the greatest misery to the German nation. But for this, many would have left unbought their silk, velvet, cloth of gold, spices, and other pomps. It arose only a little over a hundred years ago, and has already brought all princes, cities, etc., into poverty, distress, and destruction."² So also going surety is a bad thing, for it has brought many people down.³ The result of this revenue (buying or selling on credit) was a kind of mortgage on land under which German agriculture suffered much.

The letting out of money, etc. on interest is objectionable in Luther's eyes also because the gain is on the creditor's side and all the loss on the debtor's. He says the interest payer is subject to God's power, to death, sickness, water, fire, wind, hail, lightning, storms, wolves, and bad men;—all this danger the money-lord should assume.⁴ But Luther did not deny absolutely all profit from interest, though he so protected the debtor that he took away most of the stimulus to the loaner to peel the less fortunate. The creditor cannot demand the principal back at any one time,—that must be left to the discretion of the borrower.⁵ This is on the ground that the former has an equal risk. But at the same time the debtor must do everything possible to live up to his contract, must not deviate from it because

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 20:110.² 21:356.³ 22:213.⁴ 20:115.⁵ 57:360.

he thinks it is unjust, but must be thoroughly obedient to all his duties. The authorities, however, should see to it that all unjust burdens and interest are done away, for it is their duty to punish the wrong and protect the right.¹ When one's capital is his or her only stock in trade, as for instance in the case of a widow, then its letting out at interest is justifiable.² Here the moral dangers to the creditor do not exist, and Luther's sense saw that interest in these cases was an economic necessity.

Besides the usurer's, the importer's trade did not stand high with Luther. This simple peasant's son did not have much use for luxury. He does not like the over-sea trade with India, "which brings costly silk, gold-work, spices, which are of no use and only serve pomp, and drain the land and people of money." "England would have less gold, if Germany did not import its cloth. And the king of Portugal would not be so lifted up if we let him keep his spices." "These foreign wares are of no use, but they grind us down."³ Playing and dancing Luther also wanted to restrain,⁴ as also immoderate eating and drinking, for as a fact, he says, "other nations, particularly the Latin lands, have a great politeness, and they have a spite against us whom they call 'the full Germans.'"⁵

Connected with this suspicion against luxury and wealth, Luther did not like great business houses, large importing firms, or concerns which had a monopoly in whole or in part. In 1512 the Reichstag at Cologne declared against these companies, as the United States Government has against the Standard Oil Company. The Diet said that within a few years past, great societies of merchants have arisen in the empire which have in their hands alone all kinds of wares, spices, metal, woollens, etc., that they drive trade in them, and according to their own pleasure and for their own advantage, determine the price of such goods, and this is

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 23:27.

² 54:277; 55:11 f.

³ 22:181, 201.

⁴ 5:95; 57:359.

⁵ 8:283; cf. 21:357; 57:360-1.

against the holy Empire, the imperial right, and all power,—in which words one might almost hear the voice of Roosevelt. Luther agreed heartily with the Reichstag in this deliverance: “We must put a bridle in the mouth of the Fuggers and companies like them. How is it possible in one man’s lifetime to collect together such a heap of wealth, if the thing is done godly and rightly? How can one hundred gulden gain twenty in one year?”¹ (Similar questions have often been asked since in America.) “Of other companies I could say much, for all of them are inexcusable, for they act in avarice and injustice, in which nothing of a good conscience is to be found. For they have all wares in their own hands, and make what they will, and increase or lessen their stock at pleasure, and oppress and destroy the small merchants just as the pike does the small fish. Therefore no one dare ask how with a good conscience he can be in such companies. If these firms remain, right and honor go under, if the latter abide, then the companies must go.”² One can readily understand with what burning words Luther would scorioate that great American monopoly, whose history has been marked by the most unscrupulous destruction of all competitors in its field that has probably ever been known.³

Luther had no patience with the motto of some modern railroads and other corporations: Charge all that the traffic will bear. He says that the common rule of merchants is: I sell my wares as dear as I can. He replies to that that such a rule “makes room for avarice and opens the door and window to hell,” though all business is run under it. Merchants should not go beyond the common market price, and should charge “according to the time and greatness of the work” represented in the article. Better still it would be, if the authorities fixed the price by the judgment of

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 21:357.

² 22:223-4.

³ See among others the great book of the late Henry Demarest Lloyd, *Wealth against Commonwealth*, New York, 1894.

experts, in which Luther anticipated the laws of Congress and State Legislatures in regard to railroad charges.¹

There was nothing specially new in Luther's views in this branch of economics. It was the teaching of the canonists of the Middle Ages that the worth of a thing is dependent on the value of the stuff used in it, and the pains and work that it cost. Competition as a factor in the fixing of price, and subjective lust of gain, were excluded. Nor should the price be reckoned according to anticipated payment or payment on credit or contract. The Roman Catholic Church had the right and duty to watch over trade, just as the modern State claims and uses that right for itself. Of course more or less give-and-take bargaining was allowed, and market fluctuations were made use of, but the effort of the Church was to fix prices as objectively as possible.² Luther had the same idea. "How high thy price should be in trade or work," he said, "thou canst better reckon when thou considerest the time and amount of work, and takest the parable of a common day-laborer who works and sees what the day earns. Reckon then how many days the thing cost, and how much work and danger it represents; for the greater the work, the longer the time, the greater the reward or price."³ Here Luther takes the day's work of the common man as the foundation for the fixing of price, in which he anticipated Adam Smith. Luther was the enemy of great fortunes. He says that more than a fair living is not to be looked for by trade or merchandise, and that every preference by which we get an advantage over another is to be avoided.⁴

I said a moment ago that Luther taught that the best way to fix prices is the judgment of fair-minded experts, or those that passed for such. This method was frequently in use in the Middle Ages, and was provided for in Calvin's legislation in Geneva.⁵ It appears that it was not practicable

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 22:203-4, 206, 215, 218 f. ² See Ward, 74-5. ³ *Erl. Ausg.*, 22:206.

⁴ 22:203.

⁵ Elster in Conrad's *Jahrbüchern*, 1878, 180.

in Germany, and therefore Luther thought the next best thing was to go according to the market, or according to the custom of the land.¹ No one can put up his prices to get advantage of the general need,—that is theft and robbery.² Nor can one cause an artificial scarcity for personal profit, such as farmers who waste grain in order to make it dear.³ Also those who get one kind of goods in their own hands and then advance the price are transgressors against the public weal and should be punished. These merchants act as though the blessings of God were for them alone.⁴ All monopolists are not worthy to be called men. They ought to be driven out of the land.⁴ Luther lived in a transition time—a time when the simple ways of the fathers were yielding before the commerce of many lands and the increased wealth thus resulting. This disturbed the old economic relations. This disturbance the conservative Luther tried to reduce to a minimum by holding on to the old ideals, by keeping a sharp watch over the great merchants and would-be monopolists, and by a legal limitation of luxury,—all of which revealed his sound moral and religious sense and his sympathy with the common man.

The right of private property Luther allowed to the full. That right rested on work, on the precepts of the Scripture, on the duty of providing for one's own and of giving to the needy.⁵ Communism is unnatural and impossible. Men are not all equal, for God has created them different, and this difference or inequality remains.⁶ Nor is communism inculcated in the Scripture,—it was simply voluntary for those disciples who wished it (Acts iv: 32), not for Pilate and Herod and other outsiders, as our foolish peasants storm.⁷ The example in Acts iv. is not binding, though mutual helpfulness is.⁸ Family life excludes communism, says Luther.⁹ However, in case of extreme need, ordinary laws

¹ *Erl Ausg.*, 20: 204.² 57: 343.³ 57: 339.⁴ 22: 216, 218.⁵ 31: 398-9.⁶ 2: 83; 50: 185-6.⁷ Cf. 31: 299.⁸ 6: 97.⁹ 6: 96.

do not hold,—reminding one of the mediæval proverb: In extreme necessity all things are common. Luther says: "Necessity breaks iron, and can well break a law. What is right in a time of necessity may not be right in ordinary times. Who takes bread from the store without being driven by hunger is a thief, but otherwise he does right, because we are under obligation to give to him. And so with other things. But those who need should seek out princes, ministers, and pious learned people."¹ This reminds us of the sensation caused in England a few years ago by the remark of Cardinal Manning that the starving have a natural right to bread, or, to put it in his own words, that "every man has a right to work or to bread"²; but people forgot that in saying that, he was only repeating the axiom of the canon law of his own Church, or the foundation principle on which society rests. At any rate, Luther said as much. But in regard to communism Luther worked as a thoroughly conservative force.

But this did not mean that Luther was averse to municipal provisions for the common good. He placed the care of the poor on the community. "Every city and borough," he says, "must build its own churches, towers, and bells, and care for its own poor,"—not the Church as such, but the whole place as a civic entity. So far as this work has to do with the poor, it must be guided by a wise Christian spirit. Some competent man must be set over it who shall make personal investigation of needs. This man may well be a church officer. Such a social deacon Luther esteemed highly. He says: "After the preaching office there is no higher office in the Church than this poor-administration, so that Church goods are rightly and honestly looked after, to the end that poor Christians who cannot make their own living may be helped, so as not to suffer need." Whence shall these resources come? From foundations and legacies, which

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 23: 307.

² Purcell, *Life Cardinal Manning*, Lond., 1896, ii., 656.

should be turned from churches and monasteries to the poor, from voluntary contributions, from assessments laid as a matter of duty on the citizens, and from a union of neighboring communities to look after this matter by a poor-tax. In this way Luther laid the foundation for a new method with the poor, which lifted the latter from the chances of wayside charity and made their support a matter of right.¹

Speaking of Luther not being averse to municipal experiments for the common good reminds us that the semi-socialistic provision at Leisnig met his warm approval. With the emptying of the monasteries and the lapse of other old religious foundations, the question came up, What shall be done with their property and income? In Leisnig it was determined to found a common chest from which the town would wisely supply the needs of the citizens. Two nobles two counsellors, three citizens, and three peasants were a committee of administration. The first provision was that the congregation or community should have full power to call, induct, or dismiss their pastors, and to see to it that in every house God's Word should be used for instruction and reformation of life. In the churches two boxes were to be placed for gifts of bread, cheese, eggs, meat, and two offertory cases for money for the common chest, as well as for the regular offering. The president had to distribute the victuals to the poor, and on Sunday exhort to the honor of God and love to the neighbor. From the chest the church buildings were to be kept up, and the salaries of the ministers and sextons paid. This salary was to be a fixed sum, with no leeway for gifts or fees. All begging is prohibited. But all the poor are to be carefully looked after, and all orphan children educated and trained in handwork. Artisans and peasants hard-pressed shall have money advanced to them, and if they without fault of their own are incapable of paying they shall be excused the debt.

¹ See Paret, *Der Einfluss der Reformation auf die Armenpflege*, Stuttgart, 1896, 20-2.

Strangers shall also be helped in a similar way. Purchases shall be made for the common good, in cheap years provisions bought up and used for the needs of the whole community. All are obligated to regular contributions.

Now this was a pretty thorough-going socialism for that time. What was Luther's attitude toward it? Cordial. He praised it highly. He hoped that this would be an example to other towns how they could administer and use the churchly wealth. The old monks, who had not themselves freely left the cloister, should be carefully taken care of. From the city monasteries schools for both boys and girls should be provided. The Leisnig ordinance paved the way to the modern method of dealing with the problem of poverty, viz., as an affair of the whole community,—every congregation responsible for its own poor. Both schools and the poor are the subject of common civic and ecclesiastical concern,—an idea which revolutionized this branch of economics. Luther's hearty support of the Leisnig socialism reveals a side to him not often mentioned. At the same time he was far from putting a premium on poverty, as we have seen. The poor should have from the public enough for life, but their lot should not be made so easy that they would prefer poverty to work.¹

Professor Nikolaus Müller of Berlin has discovered that not only Leisnig but also Wittenberg had its common chest. As early as January, 1521, there was in the latter city an *Ordnung des gemeinen Beutels zur Erhaltung Haus- und anderer armer bedürftiger Leute zu Wittenberg*, though this had only to do with the poor. There were to be reputable overseers elected, who should help the poor intelligently with careful discrimination, based on a visit to their

¹ *Erl. Ausg.*, 21: 336. Luther published the Leisnig ordinances with a preface, 22:105 ff. (*Ordnung eines gemeinen Kastens*, 1523, reprinted in Lietzmann's admirable series of *Kleine Texte für theol. Vorlesungen und Uebungen*, Bonn, 1908), and information will be found in Ward, 90 ff.; Braasch, *Luther's Stellung zum Sozialismus*, Braunschweig, 1897, 146 ff.; Köstlin, *Martin Luther*, 5 Aufl., i., 550 f.

homes. Money should be contributed for this common object, and grain and wood should be purchased by the city for this purpose. The preachers are to exhort the people and make them considerate. For the success of the plan almost everything depends on the preachers and overseers.¹

Both the Leisnig and Wittenberg ordinances show Luther in the rôle of a civic semi-socialist reformer. City and congregation as a common body functionized as a paternal society. They looked after the income of the congregation and the systematic care of the poor. This latter is no *opus operatum*, no religious tribute to conscience or to purgatory, but an organized ethical act of the whole community. Not only the poor, but also (in Leisnig) artisans and peasants who needed temporarily a helping hand should receive it. "That is a new principle," says Seeberg, "a churchly-social thought. It is the duty of the society (or congregation) not only to help when the need is already present, but also to reach out assistance as a prophylactic against the future. In other words, not only mission, but also social, work is the task of the congregation."²

In the matter of capital, Luther never got far beyond the mediæval view. Not that he shared the mediæval praise of poverty as a special virtue, or looked upon the generous bestowal of one's goods on the Church as the chief end of life, but that he held that naïve attitude toward nature and the simple life which was the ruling one at a time when men lived near the soil, and large accumulations of capital were unknown, and were useless in any case. In some cases there had been an advance, and large business houses, like the famous firm of the Fuggers, sprang up. But this tendency Luther did not like. To keep near to nature, to carry on a small business in simplicity, industry, and piety, was his ideal. "Of the productivity of capital,"

¹ Seeberg, 841-2. Reprinted in his *Aus Religion und Geschichte*, 1906, 259.

² Seeberg, 842-3.

says Roscher, "Luther had as little conception as the strict canon law."¹ Still he had some conception of the place of capital, as he vindicates interest in case of necessity, such, for instance, as that of a widow left with a small property, who has the right to put her wealth where it will bring her in a living.²

In general it may be said of Luther's social-economic views that they were neither modern nor revolutionary. For the most part they marked a continuity with the Middle Ages, not a break. Of course his abolition of monasticism and celibacy and his treatment of work and poverty were really both modern and revolutionary, and all this had beneficent and far-reaching consequences even in the economic world. His judgment of economic questions was ethical and religious. What the Scriptures prescribed, according to his understanding of them, was valid. When either party—noble or peasant—went beyond or contradicted this norm they were self-condemned. As the Saviour did not lay down a social program, neither would he. As Christ and the apostles did not abolish slavery, neither would he abolish the Feudal System.³ But church and clergy had social duties; they must work for social betterment; they must abate wrongs; they must preach obedience, peace, brotherhood, love. But they do not have to create new social institutions. That is the work of the state with the advice of experts. Princes and the Reichstag must do away with usury and credit; they must regulate prices, watch over trade, and punish evil. "May God give again an Alexander or a Solon to restrain or prevent usury." Jurists, not preachers, have to decide such matters.⁴ The State must advance to help the people. It is not for itself, but for the common weal. It must abate social ills, do away

¹ *Gesch. der Nationalökonomik in Deutschland*, München, 1874, 59.

² *Erl. Ausg.*, 23:306.

³ 24:281.

⁴ 20: 117, 122; 22:204; 23:284, 296 ff.; 24:282.

with abuses, bad laws, etc., helped by the Church as spiritual leader and inspirer, not as head nor dominator.

Luther was not infallible. Some of his views were mistaken and have been long since outgrown. But it is doubtful whether, after all, the modern minister can do better than follow some of the main lines of his teaching: (1) Church and clergy must understand the social conditions of their age. (2) They must give their faithful testimony as to the moral and religious demands of Christianity. They shall call sin sin, misery misery. "They should not bend before the age-spirit and its idols, nor stoop before the rich and mighty, before science and popular favor."¹ Luther's reproofs of governments and overgrown mercantile establishments, of interest and revolutionary peasants, were perhaps at times one-sided, but they showed the greatness of the man. They were the expression—whether mistaken or not—of great ethical and religious principles, and these are the preacher's throne. (3) Nor need the Church hold back to-day from favoring actual remedies for economic grievances that look toward socialism, any more than she did at Leisnig and Wittenberg, but as to details of social adjustments, she had better leave these to statesmen, jurists, and other experts. (4) The State must address itself to evils in this field with determined earnestness. President Roosevelt's reformatory activity against the exploitation of the public by the great corporations is in the spirit and power of Luther. It would have made him shout for joy. (5) Preacher, statesman, social reformer, must ever keep his faith bright in God, and in His leading of the world through law and ordered progress.

¹ Seeberg, 855. Also in his *Aus Geschichte*, etc., 273.

The Year 1909 in Church History

The Presidential Address

By

Francis Albert Christie

THE YEAR 1909 IN CHURCH HISTORY.

BY FRANCIS ALBERT CHRISTIE, PROFESSOR CHURCH HISTORY,
MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
MEADVILLE, PA.

. (*The Presidential Address, read December 30, 1909*)

THE convent annalist in darker ages had slight sense of proportion and value in what he recorded. We, too, even in days of journalistic publicity, may not know the real significance of the day's happenings and the year's record is arbitrary until results appportion value. We do not know whether the high celebrations of institutional life or some simple deed or word hid in obscurity to us shall be to after times the great mark of our year. Our first thought must be of farewells spoken sadly and reverently for those who have been faithful doers in our engrossing tasks and now have ceased from their labor. For us the first remembrance is of James William Richard, Henry Charles Lea, Adolph Haus-rath, and last of all George Park Fisher, and what they achieved will carry their memory into years far distant. The death also of Father George Tyrrell wakens poignant regret in all who have viewed his spiritual chivalry in the most recent struggle within the Roman Church. The year has been calamitously marked also in modern annals by the shocking massacre of Christians in Adana and Tarsus in the month of April, an atrocity relieved only by the fact that it was instigated in futile reaction against a reform of the Turkish Constitution and so may mark the end of an evil day. In the annals of the Roman Church the year may have per-

manent significance by the third volume of the *Acta Pontificis Maximi* appearing in March, a volume whose contents cancel the veto rights of secular powers in future papal elections and under pain of excommunication forbid the cardinals to allow, during the conclave, any direct or indirect influence of the secular authorities. Our year, however, can claim this only as the date of effective publication since the veto is provided in two bulls, here collected with other orders, *Vacante Sede Apostolica* and *Communium Nobis* of 1904 (Dec. 25 and Jan. 20, 1904). It would seem difficult still to prevent the cardinal electors from knowing and estimating the preferences and antipathies of statesmen before the conclave assembles. On April 21st, the anniversary of the death of Anselm of Canterbury, Pope Pius X issued an Encyclical *Communium Rerum*, chiefly lamenting the difficulties of the Church in France and calling for resistance to Modernism. The proceedings connected with the beatification of Joan of Arc on April 18th were interpreted by some as betokening some conciliation of the Curia and France, but the close of the year shows fresh hostility in the attitude of the French Episcopate to the government schools. The death of Father Tyrrell marks no cessation in the conflict of Modernists with the Vatican, though some of the leaders of the Modernists are no longer to be counted as within the Roman Church. By decree of March 22d the Holy Office at command of the Pope inflicted the greater excommunication on Don Romolo Murri, following his election to the Italian Chamber by the Christian Democrats of Montegiorgio in the Marches. Professor Salvatore Minocchi, already suspended from priestly functions, was made Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Pisa (March 26th), and in the spring, Giovanni Sporzini, professor in the Seminary of Macerata, joined the Methodist Church, while the Jesuit Father Bartoli, with a repudiation of Modernist positions, entered the Waldensian body. In May the Pope created a Bible Institute in Rome

for the training of exegetical professors and authors under the presidency of Father Fonck of the Jesuit Order. On May 30th, the General Chapter of the Franciscans celebrated the 700th anniversary of their order. Whitsunday was marked by the first council held since 1835 of the Greek Uniates, the assembly being in Ain Tras near Beirut under the Patriarch of Antioch. From August 3d to 8th the twentieth International Eucharistic Congress met in Cologne

In the Protestant world it is pleasant to chronicle the visit of 150 British Churchmen to Germany, June 9-17, a visit which may contribute something to peace on earth, the great Genevan celebration of Calvin's birth at which our cherished colleague Professor Williston Walker was honored for his contributions to the history of Calvin's reform, and the spectacular Five Hundredth Jubilee of the University of Leipzig in which Luther's debate and the works of Leipzig theologians were not forgotten. Following the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which was in session Dec. 2-8, of 1908, another step to religious co-operation was taken in the National Congress of Religious Liberals in Philadelphia, April 27-30. Unlike the Federal Council, this was a conference not of churches but of individuals, about one thousand being enrolled from the communities of Quakers, Universalists, Unitarians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, German Evangelicals, Episcopalians, Jews, and Ethical Culturists. As in the case of the Federal Council, the proceedings illustrated the general tendency of present Christianity in terms of a social gospel. The same interest marked utterances at the crowded sessions of the Centennial Convention of the Christian Church in Pittsburgh, Oct. 11-19, where an attendance of something like 50,000 people illustrated the striking growth of this communion of Bible Christians.

In accordance with the expressed wish of the Council, I offer a statement of the publications of the year, so far

as they could be seen before the year is fully ended. I omit works of local antiquarian interest, and for the rest attempt only a general indication of their contents and character to serve for a preliminary impression of their value.

I mention first volumes in continuation of well-known series. In the Berlin edition of Greek Christian authors of the first three centuries we have Schwartz's text-critical materials and indices for the Church History of Eusebius, with Mommsen's introduction of similar character for the text of Rufinus, and, further, the third volume of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus edited by Stählin. In the Vienna corpus of Latin Fathers has appeared Petschenig's edition of Augustine's writing against the Donatists (Pars II). In the Weimar edition of Luther we have volume 26, containing writings of 1528, noteworthy specially for the discussion *Vom Abendmahl Christi*; volume 30 with writings of 1529-30, except catechisms and works dealing with the Marburg Conference; volume 36 containing the sermons of 1532. In the rather obscure American translation of Luther by J. N. Lenker (the Luther Press, Minneapolis) we have an additional volume of Epistle Sermons from Trinity Sunday to Advent.

Volume 33 of the *Texte und Untersuchungen* is a monument of patient toil on the part of Hans Freiherr von Soden, worthy son of a worthy father: *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*. Announcement is made also of a volume by Walker Reichardt: *Die Briefe des Sextus Julius Africanus an Aristides und Origenes*. In the English Texts and Studies I have received only Volume VIII, Part I: *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* by Dom R. A. Conolly of Downside Abbey, a translation of four homilies of the founder of the Nestorian School at Nisibis. The interest is not in doctrine but in ritual, and an appendix by Edmund Bishop can throw light on what may be called the psychology of public worship.

In the English translation of Janssen's *History* we have volumes XIII and XIV, dealing with schools, universities, science and culture down to the Thirty Years' War. In the *Cambridge Modern History*, volume XI deals with the growth of nationalities in the middle third of the nineteenth century. The most important chapter for our interest deals with Rome under Pius IX, but, like other parts of this series, it presupposes a knowledge of what is talked about.

We may record also the following: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, volumes V and VI; Hastings and Selbie's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, volume II. The *Realencyclopädie für Protestant ische Theologie und Kirche* has added a serviceable *Registerband*. The *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* has progressed through volume V and the volumes meet with favor as they appear. S. M. Deutsch (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Bonn, Marcus und Weber) has presented a convenient survey of Church History complete in one volume of 800 pages. Its judicious and well-balanced exposition must be of value to students and general readers and the last part of the book is an aid in constructing the story of German Protestantism and Modern Catholicism. While Dr. Deutsch extends his view to Christianity outside of Germany, the four and a half pages devoted to North America betray an ignorance of our history. Of far greater importance to us all is the co-operative *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* edited by Gustav Krüger (Tubingen, J. C. B. Mohr). Of this the fourth part is now published dealing with the period since 1689. This is the work of Lic. Horst Stephan of Marburg who has incorporated an account of the development of sermon, hymn, and ritual by Rudolf Gunkel and a sound treatment of American Church History by Professor Walter Rauschenbusch of Rochester. The work is distinguished by encyclopedic character, by rich bibliographies, by giving a basis of *Kulturgeschichte* for the study,

and by its extensive account of Catholic Church history. This undertaking is an event of first importance for the year in our field of interest. Heussi's *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte*, begun in 1907, has been completed within our year, a concise and accurate outline. Of similar value but of simpler form for students is H. Appel's *Kurgefasste Kirchengeschichte für Studierende*, Teil I, *Alte Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig, Boehme), to secure the thorough mastery of dates, names, facts, and main content of patristic works with useful chronological lists and synchronistic tables. This is an excellent model of what we call a syllabus. Erwin Preuschen's *Analecta* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr) appears in a new and enriched form, affording relatively complete materials for a study of the persecutions. Materials for the history of the canon will form a second part. A like service is rendered by Bernhard Pick: (a) *Paralipomena, Remains of Gospels and Sayings of Christ* (Chicago, Open Court Publishing Co.); (b) *Apocryphal Acts; Paul, Peter, John, Andrew and Thomas* (*ibid.*). Charles Bigg's *Origins of Christianity* (Oxford, Clarendon Press) is sadly associated with the loss to the world of this distinguished scholar. A few hours after sending the work to the press, Dr. Bigg was seized with the illness of which he died two days later (June 15, 1908). As may be expected by all, this last work is notable for rich detail of knowledge and for striking and illuminating comment. Particular chapters will be welcomed as able treatments, but the work as a whole is disappointing for lack of constructive power. Of similar scope is Gwatkin's *Early Church History to 313* (London, Macmillan) in two opulently printed volumes. He avoids the encyclopedic digest method of such works as Moeller-Schubert and offers an interesting narrative with some literary garnish and an infusion of his own personality. The narrative usefully incorporates the material of the sources (Hippolytus on Callistus, The Age of the Severi, the circumstantial account of Diocletian's persecution).

While many of its observations will challenge criticism, as a work of literature from an erudite scholar, it will serve to give popular extension to the main results of scientific history. The International Theological Library fills a gap in our literature by the publication of Adeney's *Greek and Eastern Churches* (New York, Scribner). After a good survey of the early centuries, the work becomes specially helpful in its account of the Mohammedan period, and in the second part which deals with the life of the separate national churches to the present day. In this connection may be mentioned an American monograph by Leon Arpel, *The Armenian Awakening: A History of the Armenian Church, 1820-1860* (Chicago University Press), contributing knowledge of the modern growth of the Romanist Community, the surviving remnants of Paulicianism, the effect of Protestant missions, and the relation of the Armenian Constitution of 1860 to the recently restored Turkish reform constitution of 1876. Returning to the field of earlier history, we regret the too late appearance of volumes sure to be of critical interest, the Abbé Vacandard's second series of *Études de Critique et d'Histoire Religieuse* (Paris, Lecoffre), and Charles Guignebert's *La Primauté de Pierre et la Venue de Pierre à Rome* (Paris, Nourry). French scholarship is brilliantly represented earlier in the year by the work of Mgr. Pierre Battifol: *L'Église Naissante et le Catholicisme* (Paris, Lecoffre). This argumentative history in defence of the Roman Catholic Church provokes wonder that Mgr. Battifol should have lost his office in consequence of the Papal Encyclical on the Teaching of the Modernists. The view of an historical development of the early Catholic Church, which as shaped by Ritschl and his followers has been popularized in France by August Sabatier (*The Religion of Authority and the Religion of Spirit*), is here met with an historical argument that the Church was born Catholic, that Christ founded a church with fixed, definite hierarchic constitution, where the hierarchy is thus of

divine right and the bishop of Rome inherits a primacy of infallible teaching and sovereign jurisdiction. Mgr. Battifol neglects nothing, shrinks from no issue, and argues with power and zeal. We may expect to hear many echoes of this work.

In connection with the early centuries there remains a group of books of very different character. An English man of letters (Mr. Clement Shorter) has recently lamented that not one vital book has been added to our literature during the year. Some of us will profess surprise at the failure to recognize the delightfulness and vitality of T. R. Glover's *Conflict of Religion in the Roman Empire* (London, Methuen). This is surely one of the finest fruits of the best philological study in the highest sense of that term, and its literary beauty lends an added perfection to its scholarship. Those who are nervous about the effect of a *religion-geschichtliche Methode* should reassure themselves by reading Glover's inspiring account of the genesis and spread of the Christian movement. The question of the relation of pagan cults to Christianity gains clarity also from Franz Cumont's *Religions Orientales* (1906) which has appeared in a second edition (Paris, Leroux), and in a discriminating work by De Jong, *Das Antike Mysterienwesen* (Leiden, Brill). The new third volume of the *Geschichte des Untergangs der Antiken Welt* by Otto Seeck (Berlin, Siemenroth) is one of the most readable expositions, however oddly proportioned. The subject of the volume is *Religion und Sittlichkeit* and the very dedication to Albrecht Dieterich may show that he assumes the detached position of an observer of all the religions and moral conditions of the society in which Christianity found its mission. This perspective affords new interest. The book presents an excellent construction of the growth of Christian organization, a thorough discussion of the persecutions, a longer study of Donatism than is frequent, and a detailed account of the outbreak of the Arian dispute and of the Council of Nicea. The book

is attractively written in a style clear, firm, and rapid. A separate volume contains the notes in support of the text.

Two works known only by title may be mentioned: *The Thousand and One Churches*, by Sir William Ramsay and Gertrude Bell (London, Hodder & Stoughton), and *The Two Empires, the Church and the World*, by Westcott (London, Macmillan).

Since 1885, when Schepss discovered in Würzburg a considerable part of the writings of Priscillian, the reputation of the heretic martyr has improved, though Loofs, Hilgenfeld, and Künstle have asserted traces of Gnosticism. E. C. Babut, who in 1904 exhibited in his *Concile de Turin* the erudition and critical acumen fostered by the *Fondation Thiers*, now fulfils a promise made in his earlier work and publishes a monograph on *Priscillian et le Priscillianisme* (Paris, Champion). In this he makes evident that the dispute involved both Spain and Gaul, that Martin of Tours was endangered and that Priscillian was no heretic. The Priscillianists were only an ascetic and pietist party and the tradition of heresy is due to the falsification of Itacius, Bishop of Assonoba. The complete scholarship of M. Babut wakens our admiration. Of works of larger scope, we welcome heartily the English version of Gustav Krüger's *Papacy, Its Idea and History* (New York, Putnam), and Professor Alexander Clarence Flick's *The Rise of the Mediæval Church and Its Influence on the Civilization of Western Europe from the First to the Thirteenth Century* (New York, Putnam). Professor Flick promises a volume on the Reformation and one on the Modern Church as well as a Source Book for Church History. The book is the fruit of labor as a college teacher of Church history in Syracuse and by its well-chosen topics will enable a student to construct the material in orderly fashion. On his guard against a Protestant bias, the author indulges in an excessive ultramontaniam of which the Abbé Turmel would not approve. Interest in the impending publication of

Schubert's volume on the mediæval period is stimulated by the same author's brief but important pamphlet on *Das Älteste Germanisches Christentum oder die sogenannte "Arianismus" der Germanen* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr). Arianism is presented as the specific German form of Christianity before Romanizing influence began and since it ended, for the "Arianism" to which German tribes were converted was the "critical Arianism" of the Homœans, restricted in its dogmatic utterance to Biblical expression. Bible Christianity is Germanic. The Arian type appears also in the tribal or national organization of the Church. This interesting discussion is being carried further with application to canon law by Professor Ulrich Stutz of Bonn in the *Internationale Wochenschrift* (Dec. 11 and ff.). F. Zehetbauer: *Das Kirchenrecht bei Bonifatius* (Wien, Kirsch) did not come to hand.

In the publication of the Munich Church History Seminar, beside Franz Wieland's study of *Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, and Striefenhofer's *Geschichte der Kirchweihe*, contributions closely related in theme we have Father Schmoll's *Busslehre der Frühscholastik* and Gromer's interesting *Laienbeicht im Mittelalter* (München, Lentner). Denying Henry C. Lea's view that mediæval confession to a layman was a survival from the earlier church before private penance before the priest began, Gromer gives an interesting view of the manner in which confession came to have an independent value and dates confession to a layman from the eleventh century. Its vogue was in the thirteenth century; its decline due to Franciscan teaching and the Council of Trent

Of less interest is the monograph of the Bollandist Father Hippolyte Delahaye on *Les Légendes Grecques des Saintes Militaires* (Paris, Picard et Fils). What was the relation of the religion of peace to the army, since so many Greek saints wear buckler and lance? Father Delahaye limits himself to the literary problems involved in the

legends of a few of these warlike saints and prints from manuscript sources a selection of texts. The legends of St. George, for example, are gradual imaginative embroideries of a primitive story of a martyr in Lydda (near Joppa), with a fusion between his story and that of George of Cappadocia, the Arian bishop of Alexandria, martyred under Julian. The dragon exploit is a Western addition.

The Franciscan anniversary is marked by the appearance of a complete history of the order to the present day by Father Heribert Holzapfel: *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens* (Freiburg, Herder). This was undertaken at the instance of the present General Dionysius Schuler, to whom is due also the new organ, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, begun in 1908. One of the interesting parts of this work is its account of the tertiary orders. But this official account is probably of less historical interest than W. Moir Bryce's *Scottish Grey Friars* (Edinburgh, Wm. Green & Sons), where the philanthropic zeal and gospel preaching of the friars are made significant elements in the preparation for the Reformation movement. It is a pleasure to record the admirable contribution of Dr. Edward B. Krehbiel, who has shared in the programme of our annual meeting. His prize essay on *The Interdict: Its History and its Operation, with Special Attention to the Time of Pope Innocent III.* (American Historical Association, Washington) is the first monograph attempting a history of the origin, process, and effect of the interdict. His appendix gives the historical circumstances of eighty-five cases of threatened or actual interdict under Innocent III.

The following announcements are made: Von der Ropp, *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Mainz von 1289-1396* (Leipzig, Veit & Co.). E. Hennig, *Die päpstlichen Zehnten aus Deutschland im Zeitalter des avignonesischen Papsttums und während des grossen Schismas* (Halle, Niemeyer).

The Mediæval Church and the Papacy by Arthur C. Jennings (London, Methuen & Co.) is one of a series of

Handbooks of English Church History due to Creighton's initiative and avoids the frequent insularity of English Church historians by telling the story in a setting of general mediæval history. English national feeling has not kept the author from generous fairness to the papacy. The period covered is from 1135 to 1485. In the same series is Henry Gee's *Reformation Period*, which is probably the most satisfactory account extant of the English Reformation. It is written from the sources and is without hostility to the various parties involved. The opening chapter on "The Early Tudor Church" is a valuable contribution by a first-class man. We mention here the work of J. L. Morrison, who publishes for the first time from a unique manuscript, Reginald Pecock's *Book of Faith* (Glasgow, Maclehose), with an important introductory essay on this modernist Renaissance figure of the fifteenth century. This pre-Reformation period has been made attractive to general readers by Lützow, *Life and Times of John Hus* (New York, Dutton), and by an historical romance translated from the Bohemian, *Last Days of John Hus*, with an introduction by W. R. Morfree (London, English Tract Society). To the reader of Janssen and Belfort Bax, no new comprehension is offered by J. S. Schapiro's *Social Reform and the Reformation* (Columbia University Studies), but the appendix translates five important documents and gives an abstract of Emperor Sigismund's Reformation. The publication is valuable by making these materials accessible with a useful discussion. A year ago to-morrow, died Dr. Emil Egli, a leading authority in the investigation of Swiss Reformation history. Among his papers was found the manuscript of a *Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte*, 1519-1525, which had been nearly completed in 1902, when with Georg Finsler he was engaged to edit the new complete edition of Zwingli's works. In spite of some incompleteness and the appearance of new sources since 1902, the Zwingli Verein of Zürich commissioned Finsler to edit it for publication (Zürich,

Zürcher & FÜRrer). The notes and citations owe their form and worth to Finsler. The text stands as the life-work of an accomplished scholar.

For the Reformation period in Germany we have titles of two works which have not arrived in season for examination. H. von Schubert has just issued a work on *Bekenntnisbildung und Religions-politik, 1529-30 (1524-1534), Untersuchungen und Texte* (Gotha, F. A. Perthes) apparently on the basis of his articles in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, and the third volume is announced of Emil Sehling's *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, Reisland), one of five volumes of source material subventioned by the German Emperor. The title of von Schubert's book at once suggests the volume which must be ranked as the most important contribution from America to the literature of the year. It is the monumental work of the lamented Dr. James W. Richard, on *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia, Lutheran Publication Society). For the further study of the Augsburg Confession and related articles and of the doctrinal controversies leading to the Formula of Concord, Dr. Richard's volume is an indispensable and authoritative study which wins distinction for American scholarship. The renewed interest in the Italian Reformation makes us anticipate a work just announced by J. Heep on *Juan de Valdes* (Leipzig, Heinsius). Of the abundant publications excited by the Calvin celebration, we need note only Wernle, *Calvin's Lebenswerk in seinen Briefen* (Tübingen, Mohr); Doumergue and others, *Calvin and the Reformation* (London, Revell); *Calvinreden* (Tübingen, Mohr).

I have not seen the new volume of Ludvig von Pastor's *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Paul III) (Freiburg, Herder). For knowledge of French Reformation history, new insight is to be gained from *The Wars of Religion in France, 1559-76*, by Professor James Westfall Thompson of the University of Chicago (University

of Chicago Press). This interesting and well-written book relates the fortunes of the Huguenot movement to economic conditions.

The Leipzig Jubilee has occasioned the publication by Otto Kirn of a nobly printed *Festschrift* with beautifully executed portraits of great worthies in Leipzig theological history: (*Die Leipziger Theologische Fakultät in fünf Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig, Hirzel). From the Kingsgate Press is reported *The Record of the General Baptist Churches in England*, vol. i., 1654-1728. In continuation of the *Studien sur Geschichte des neuren Protestantismus*, we have a lengthy essay by Walter Wendland on *Die Religiosität und die Kirchen-politik Friedrich Wilhelm des Dritten* (Giessen, Töpelmann), an interesting study of the transition from rationalism to moderate Lutheran orthodoxy of the prince who effectually united the divided Protestants of Prussia.

Paul Thureau-Dangins, *Le Catholicisme en Angleterre an XIXme Siècle* (Paris, Blond), fosters French interest in Newman by a summary of his three volumes on the same subject. French dealings with the Congregations and the Separation Law occasion a work by André Mater on *La Politique Religieuse de la République Français* (Paris, Nourry). This is a polemic discussion for the benefit of foreign readers, but it affords some access to historical material of value. The author hails the present activity of the Church of England as promising an equilibrium for the world between the Catholic and militarist tendency of Germany and the pacific lay tendencies of France. The French situation of to-day finds a background in the inner history of recent French Catholicism as presented by George Weill in his *Histoire du Catholicisme Libéral en France, 1828-1908* (Paris, Felix Alcan). Weill constructs three episodes of effort to win the Church for liberalism, Lamennais' work for political liberty, the movement for democratic life in 1830, and the intellectual movement of

the recent Modernists. The work has a useful bibliography. Joseph McCabe's *Decay of the Church of Rome* (New York, Dutton) is an important statistical inquiry contributing to history. He concludes that in the last seventy years the Roman Church has made a net loss of eighty million followers, and notes that of the one-hundred and ninety million adherents, one hundred and twenty million are to be reckoned as illiterate. The work of Carl Jentsch (*Christentum und Kirche in Vergangenheit Gegenwart und Zukunft* (Leipzig, Haberland) is a bulky causerie about the past in the interest of a future reformed Catholicism. De Cesare's work of two years ago appears in an English condensation by Helen Zimmern: *The Last Days of Papal Rome* (London, Constable). This is richly entertaining by its word description, picture description, and anecdote. Its brief account of the Vatican Council appears superficial, unless it be indeed that in this case the surface play tells the real story more than the hidden debates of the theologians. For the more recent developments in Italy, particularly the growth of Italian Modernism, a valuable account is given by Jordan in connection with his translation of Labanca's brochure published in 1890 (Jordan and Labanca, *The Study of Religion in Italian Universities*, Oxford Frowde). Labanca's essay deals with the university situation since 1870, and was meant as a protest against the failure of the government to replace the suppressed theological faculties by scientific study of religion. Jordan endeavors to estimate the intellectual strength and popular weakness of the Modernist movement. A more comprehensive history of Modernism is given by Johannes Kübel, *Geschichte des Katholischen Modernismus* (Tübingen, Mohr), who takes his start with the Americanism of Hecker, and includes the difficulties of Schell and Erhardt, of Laberthonnière and Loisy.

We return to English themes with the mention of *A History of the Church of England* by M. W. Patterson

(Longmans), a summary of secondary value by a moderate Anglican. Another work of uncommon significance fills a gap in our knowledge of Catholicism in modern England. It is the solid work of Bernard Ward on *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England, 1781-1803* (London, Longmans). The turning of the tide for English Catholicism is here elaborately recorded with full use of unpublished materials from the archives of the sees of Clifton and Westminster.

The personality of John Wesley gains new charm in our year by the contents of the first volume of a new edition of his *Journal*, enriched by copious materials recently unburied from unpublished diaries kept in cipher (*The Journal of John Wesley*, edited by Nehemiah Cumock, London, Culley). This expensive work is to be had by subscription only. The account in the *Spectator* of Nov. 27th shows how rich the interest of it is. The further development of Methodism is given us in *A New History of Methodism*, by Townsend and others (London, Hobbe & Stoughton). To this important co-operative history Professor J. A. Faulkner of our own Society has contributed valuable chapters.

A transition to American themes is made also by Winnifred Cockshott in an altogether admirable account of *The Pilgrim Fathers, Their Church and Colony* (New York, Putnam). This is exceedingly well constructed, judiciously appreciative, and well written. The full concrete study of the Pilgrims' life in Holland considers possible Dutch models for features of New England life. *Roger Williams* is studied with fair judgments and with detail beyond preceding accounts by Edmund J. Carpenter (New York, Grafton Press). The relation of political conditions to Williams's banishment is here very justly presented. In the *Studien zur Praktischen Theologie* (Giessen, Töpelmann) appears an instructive historical discussion by Hans Haupt of North Tonowanda, N. Y., on *Staat und Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika*, dealing not

only with the relations once existing but with the actual place of religion in public life. This brief work can furnish interesting points of view for the total construction of our American Church history. Dr. C. Henry Smith of Goshen College, Indiana, has published a work of independent research on *The Mennonites of America* (Goshen, Ind., the author). It is an orderly account of the various Mennonite settlements in America drawn from county records and private manuscripts. The publication of Emerson's *Journal* and of Washington Gladden's *Recollections* (Houghton, Mifflin) indicates material for the student of religious change.

In the field of the History of Doctrine further contributions await mention. Harnack has revised his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Tübingen, Mohr) for a fourth edition of which two volumes have appeared. New elements are found in the early sections on the Gospel of Jesus and the Apostolic Age, in view of recent studies by Harnack and others, while the second volume adds discussion of Paulicianism and Islam. G. Klein, *Der älteste Christliche Katechismus und die Jüdische Propaganda-Litteratur* (Berlin, Reimer), tries to extricate the Jewish propagandist form of instruction antecedent to the Didache. *The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Fathers* by C. K. Staudt (University of Chicago Press) is a good doctoral study without special novelty of result. The seventh fac-simile of Gerhard Rauschen's *Florilegium Patristicum* provides materials for the study of the sacraments in the first four centuries (Bonn, Hanstein), while Dodwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (2 vols., Longmans), gives copious extracts in translation from theologians of every age, a repository of opinions without the expected historical construction. In 1905, Edward Schwartz published a neglected bit of law material from a Syriac codex and argued therefrom the fact of a synod in Antioch 324-5, where fifty-nine bishops

excommunicated Eusebius of Cæsarea. In the session of the Prussian Royal Academy May 14, 1908, Harnack claimed that this synodal epistle was a later falsification. Schwartz having defended his view, Harnack again discussed the subject on March 11th of this year: *Die angebliche Synode von Antiochia im Jahre 324-5* and effectually maintains his denial (Berlin, Reimer). In the transactions of the same Academy we have also Loof's study of *Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Homousianer von Sardica* (343), a critical reconstruction of the text with annotations. He sets a high value on the symbol as an expression of Western views truer to monotheism and to the human life of Jesus than the formulation that became orthodox doctrine. He sets forth also that this symbol was meant as an authentic exposition of the Nicene symbol of 325.

Tixeront's *Histoire des Dogmes* (II, De Saint Athanase à Saint Augustin, Paris, Lecoffre) deserves its marked popular success by the lucidity of its exposition rather than for historical explanation. Differences are lightly handled. Can one obtain here a clear idea of what differentiates Augustine from Greek theology? Some skill is shown in omission where ecclesiastical danger is possible.

For the scholastic period a number of works come from Catholic sources. Dr. Martin Grabmann of Eichstätt has produced the first volume of a *Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode* (Freiburg, Herder) resting on unprinted as well as published sources. The command of the sources is an exhibition of extraordinary *Belesenkeit*, and references to all the modern discussions of scholastic theology are impeccable in temper. He would seem to see the early Fathers through a somewhat scholastic lens. The enthusiastic account of Anselm's method is appropriate for the year which is the eight hundredth anniversary of Anselm's death. The anniversary is marked also by L. Heinrich's monograph on *Die Genugtuungstheorie des heiligen Anselmus von Canterbury* (Paderborn, Schöningk) which is a rather laborious

and lifeless exposition. The substance of Anselm's theory is justified and some improvement in details of its logic are suggested. Allusion to objections confines itself to some comments of Harnack. In quite a different vein is the American production of Dr. George C. Foley of the Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia: Anselm's *Theory of the Atonement* (New York, Longmans). This is a severe criticism with a plea for a return to the simpler and freer meaning of Incarnation in Greek theology. The work affords a useful survey of Patristic teaching on the value of Christ's death and discusses the relation of Anselm's theory to other scholastic and to Protestant theology.

The *Essai Historique sur les Rapports entre la Philosophie et la Foi de Berengiers de Tours à St. Thomas d'Aquin* by Th. Heitz (Paris, Lecoffre) is an industrious study by a young Catholic doctor without results to alter current views. Liberal instruction and the gratification of historical curiosity can be found in *Les Écoles et l'Enseignement de la Théologie pendant la Première Moitié du XIIe Siècle* (Paris, Lecoffre) by G. Robert. The first part deals with the schools in general, their number, organization, method of instruction, while the second part considers specifically the instruction in theology. The work entertains by its very precise and interesting detail about the student's daily life and the order and duration of his studies. Abelard's activity and influence loom large in this account. A valuable appendix studies the chronology of Abelard's works; a second argues that the contested *Summa Sententiarum* attributed to Hugh of St. Victor is to be assigned, as one manuscript assigns it, to a Master Otto, who drew from the writings of Hugh. That a scholastic, Gilbert de la Poirée, should be claimed as the ancestor of the Spirituals and Fraticelli is unexpected, but it seems to be easily established by Paul Fournier, Dean of the Law Faculty of Grenoble, in *Études sur Joachim de Flore et ses Doctrines* (Paris, Picard). After expounding the views of the Abbot

Joachim, he attributes a *Liber de Vera Philosophia* found in Grenoble to a faithful disciple of Gilbert de la Poirée, and from its striking resemblances to the theological ideas of Joachim concludes that it was under the influence of just such a view of the Trinity that the Abbot attributed successive ages of the world's government to the three persons of the Trinity.

Der Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther über die Willensfreiheit, by Karl Zickendraht (Leipzig, Hinrich), is a promising entrance into the field of doctrinal history by a scholar of precision and thoroughness. Erasmus, he holds, did not freely choose the subject for debate. The problem of the will's freedom was in the air at the outset of the Reformation, as is shown by publications of Johann Eck, Wirnpina, Staupitz, and Vadrian's edition of Valla's dialogue *De Libero Arbitrio*. The book provides exhaustive detail as to the circumstances leading to the dispute and the critical analysis of the discussion is of more than historical value. *La Théologie de Bellarmin* (Paris, Beauchesne) is by Professor de la Servièrre of the Jesuit Order. What he describes as a modest study is a ponderous volume and seems to be the first complete modern exposition of the theology of Bellarmin, whose Anti-Protestant Summa was the fullest expression of ultramontane controversialism in the Counter Reformation.

Hefner's *Entstehungsgeschichte des Trienter Rechtfertigungsdekretes* (Paderborn, Schöningk) has some new documentary material, but is written with considerable constraint from dogmatic interests. Georg Hoffmann concludes his important work on *Die Lehre von der Fides Implicita* by the third volume: *Vom Ende des Reformationszeitalter bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Hinrich). It is history, but it is history animated by a present-day interest, as appears in the concluding discussion about the relation of authority to a spiritually free faith. It is a history which recounts the victory of explicit assurance over all

blind implicit faith. The recurrence to the theme of an actual religious experience makes appropriate in closing the mention of Rufus Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion* (New York, Macmillan), a very useful survey which without the claim of independent research affords a much more complete story of Christian mysticism than the older books. In particular its interesting account of mystical tendencies among the Anabaptists and the sects of the English Commonwealth give the volume distinctive value.

In closing this imperfect survey, I venture to express the hope that our Society will eventually publish in inexpensive form a monthly or quarterly bulletin which may be on the one hand a record of ecclesiastical events after the manner of the *Chronik der Christlichen Welt*, and on the other hand may, without aiming at formal reviews, afford some explanatory statement of the literature as it appears. Experience has shown that important publications in America have little prominence in the book trade and when issued by denominational publishing houses are doubly obscured. A bulletin could serve as a clearing-house of information for all denominations. In this era of Church federation, such a suggestion may, I hope, be welcomed. Doubtless the chief obstacle to such an enterprise is the lack of financial means. All the more, I am impelled therefore to utter the hope that our Society may secure from some benefactor a fund which can be used not only for the purpose named, but for other unremunerative but important publication. With such a fund, our Society could secure the publication of much documentary material which would be of immense service to students of American religious history.

The Church and Medieval Trade Unions

By
Edward Waite Miller

THE CHURCH AND MEDIEVAL TRADE UNIONS

BY EDWARD WAITE MILLER, PASTOR OF THE SIXTH
REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH, ALBANY, NEW YORK

*(Read in Joint Session with the American Historical Association,
Thursday, December 30, 1909)*

THE instinct of association must be regarded as among the most elemental and important of human instincts. It has bound men together in various forms of organization, domestic, political, religious. The family, the state, the church are its most familiar products. But there is another type of association distinct from these, prompted by different motives and seeking different ends. Of this type the Guild is historically the most familiar example. It may be described as a voluntary association of those living near together, who unite in a fraternal spirit for a common purpose, who feast and worship together, pay contributions into a common fund, and aid each other in case of poverty, sickness, bereavement, or other misfortune.

Its essential principle was close fraternal association for mutual welfare and enjoyment and for co-operation in a common enterprise. The one thing that chiefly differentiates the Medieval Guilds from organizations in our own day bearing certain resemblances to them is the intimacy of relationship and genuine fraternal spirit which existed in them.

Nothing is more indicative of the genius of an age or people than the forms under which they organized themselves for purposes of government or religion or business. In their corporate institutions we find an expression of their deeper life. It is this fact that gives such permanent

interest to the Medieval Guilds. They are as distinctive of the Middle Ages as Feudalism. To a considerable degree they were the product of the same forces. The Guilds, however, did not reach their full development till Feudalism had begun to wane, and in its overthrow and the making of the modern political world the Guilds had no small part.

Whether the Guilds are to be regarded as a survival in a modified form of the Roman *collegia*, or as having been derived from the Germanic world in which they arose as a substitute for the family or clan, one fact is plain, that by the seventh century Guilds of one type were a conspicuous feature in the trading towns of England, and by the time of Charlemagne they were of sufficient importance to be the subject of considerable legislation by him. England has been called the birthplace of the Guilds and London their cradle. But it is probable that the same forces that brought them to early development in England caused them to appear soon after in France and Germany and elsewhere. For whether derived from the Roman *collegia* or the Germanic clan, or from neither, the Guild took its distinctive character from its political and social and industrial environment.

The inefficiency of the civil institutions during the early Middle Ages, the insecurity of life and property, led men to band themselves together for mutual safety and welfare. On the other hand, the narrow horizon of the Medieval man, his lack of participation in the national life or the world life, intensified his interest in the affairs of his own neighborhood and fellow-craftsmen, and made him willing to draw the bonds of association with his friends and co-laborers much closer than the modern man desires. The ideal of the Guild was a larger family. The spirit of brotherhood was its vital breath.

So far as the general features of their organization were concerned, the Guilds were all cast in one mold. Classified on the basis of the special purpose for which they were

organized, they fall naturally into four groups. The Frith Guilds were formed for the protection of the community from attack or internal disorder. The Social or Religious Guilds were for the cultivation of the religious life, not in cloister seclusion, but in society. The Merchant Guilds aimed at the control of trade and the government of the towns in their own interests; while the Craft Guilds were for the protection and general welfare of those engaged in the same handicraft.

These Craft Guilds, which claim our especial attention at this time, were usually the last kind of Guild to be organized in a town; they ultimately became, however, in point of numbers, the most important.

In the political evolution of the Medieval town the Merchant Guild usually contrived to obtain a monopoly, under charter from the monarch, of trade privileges and citizenship as well. Thus the merchants came to constitute an aristocracy of wealth and privilege. And they naturally framed laws inimical to the interests of the helpless craftsmen. It was this political and industrial situation that led the craftsmen in the cities, or at least the more well-to-do and intelligent among them, to organize for their own protection and betterment. They naturally adopted the Guild form of organization with which they were familiar. And it was by means of their organization in Guilds that the free craftsmen, and later the serfs who drifted into the cities in search of employment, obtained citizen rights and the control of their handicraft and the protection of their interests.

The Merchant Guilds, entrenched behind their privileges, naturally resisted the efforts of the craftsmen to win political and industrial liberty. The organization of the Craft Guilds began at least as early as the eleventh century, and by the end of the fourteenth century they had everywhere won in the long and sometimes fierce conflict which brought them citizenship and economic freedom and an honorable place in the life of their cities.

As was said a moment ago, the Guilds were all cast in one mold, and animated by the fraternal spirit. Whatever else it might be, the Guild was essentially a brotherhood. Its members must do more than meet to transact business. They must cultivate intimate personal relations and *esprit de corps*. The fact of their corporate life must be given symbolic expression. There must be a Guild hall and a Guild livery and coat-of-arms and trade-mark. There must be stated feastings and public worship together and parades in the streets.

The exacting conditions of admission to Guild membership emphasizes the same fact of brotherhood. The candidate must be of blameless character and must have demonstrated in a long apprenticeship his ability and his mastery of his craft. The regulations of a Guild, confirmed in its charter, were usually declared to have two purposes: to maintain the high quality of the work done by its members, and to "secure their temporal and eternal welfare." It was to accomplish this second purpose that the Guilds maintained their close relationship to the Church, which in the Medieval age was regarded as the only source of spiritual grace.

In order to realize how close this relationship was, it is important to remember that before the Craft Guilds were formed there existed a class of Guilds, mentioned above, whose sole purpose was the cultivation of the religious life. They were entirely distinct from the monkish brotherhoods, and were fraternities of laymen or priests, or both, who sought association for the development of their religious knowledge and experience and usefulness. The regulations of the Craft Guilds were framed very largely after those of these religious brotherhoods. In fact, in some cities, where the organization of Craft Guilds was opposed, the craftsmen organized under the cover of a Religious Guild. And even later, it was customary for Craft Guilds to affiliate themselves with Religious Guilds having the same

patron saint. Thus the Guild ideal and form of organization which the craftsmen adopted had a distinctly religious character. As Brentano well expresses it: "In reading the statutes of these Craft Guilds one might sometimes fancy that these old craftsmen cared only for the welfare of their souls."

Each Guild chose some saint as its patron, and not infrequently bore his name. A pious motto was usually selected. There is a refreshing frankness and complacency in the way these medieval craftsmen refer to themselves and their piety. So humble a craft as that of the skinners of London designate themselves as "The Masters and Wardens, brothers and sisters, of the Guild or Fraternity of the Skinners of London, to the honor of God and the precious body of our Lord Jesus Christ." Their motto was: "To God only be all glory."

Each Guild celebrated the day of its patron saint by processions in the streets and by attending public worship in a body. Usually a Guild maintained connection with some particular church where it may have built a chapel or contributed a window or rendered some other service. Sometimes a Guild by rendering some unusual service to a church obtained an interest in all the prayers of its clergy.

A marked illustration of the religious character of these Guilds is found in their funeral customs. Each member was under most solemn obligation to attend the public obsequies of his deceased brother, and make a contribution and offer prayers for the rest of his soul. Once each year the Guild held a memorial service in their church at which a requiem was sung for all the departed Guild-members—each being mentioned by name.

Nearly every Guild had its own chaplain, who received a stipend from the common funds. It was his duty to conduct the religious exercises connected with the stated meetings of the Guild, to "say grace" at its feasts, to celebrate

masses for the benefit of the Guild, and to act as its spiritual adviser.

Nothing better illustrates the brotherly spirit and religious character of the Guilds than the oath taken on admission to membership. The following is a good example: "This hear ye, Aldermen, I shall true man be to God Almighty and to our Lady Saint Mary and to the holy Virgin and Martyr, Saint Katherine." Then follows the vow of allegiance to the Guild officers and the promise to have a care for the spiritual welfare of the Guild-brethren. Among the regulations of the Tailors Guild of Exeter is the following: "Ye shall pray for all the brothers and sisters of the fraternity and all the benefactors of the same, and specially for our Sovereign Lord the King, Edward IV., first founder of this Guild and fraternity, and for his Queen, and for the Princes and for the King's progeny."

In the regulations of some Guilds we find other prayers, including a wider range of objects, enjoined: prayers for "the state of the Holy Church," for "peace and unity in the land," for "all Christendom," for "the Pope of Rome and his Cardinals and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and for the Holy Land that it may be delivered from the hands of the Infidel, and for all Archbishops and Bishops and all Priests and Orders of the Holy Church."

The religious character of the Guilds is further indicated by the special services which they sometimes rendered to a church, such as the erection or repair of a chapel, or the beautifying of an altar, or the keeping of candles burning before a shrine, or the rendering of a sacred drama, or participation in a Corpus Christi procession. And often other public services rendered by the Guilds, though not distinctly religious, were rendered in a religious spirit. Whether it was repairing the town-wall, or building a needed bridge, or establishing a public bath, or redeeming captive slaves, or feeding the poor, or erecting and maintaining schools or orphanages or hospitals, it was done as an act of religion.

When any Guild member went upon a pilgrimage his brethren contributed toward his expenses, accompanied him for a distance as he started on his journey, and if possible went to meet him when he returned. There is record of an English Guild that every year sent one of its members to the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury and paid his expenses.

It is significant that the Guilds excluded from membership those guilty of offences condemned by the Church, such as heresy and sacrilege.

But the vital connection between the Guilds and the Medieval Church is most clearly shown by the fact that the Protestant Reformation, which reorganized the Church in all Northern Europe, either destroyed or caused a radical reorganization of the Guilds.

That the Medieval Church favored the Guilds is shown, not only by the close relations which she encouraged them to establish with her, but by the many services which she rendered them, and by the fact that her bishops frequently became their patrons. The opposition of the Roman Catholic Church to the Masonic Order is a comparatively recent thing. In its original character as a Guild of Masons the Order enjoyed the full favor of the Church.

The strong religious influence of the Guild resulted in an attitude toward his work on the part of the craftsman that is very significant. Each Guild chose, when possible, a patron saint whom history or tradition represented as having been engaged while on earth in its particular handicraft. Often these saints were pictured as holding in their hands the tools of their trade. This was to relate the daily toil of the craftsman with the blessed saints whose favor he sought. He could not but feel the dignity of the labor in which these holy personages had once been engaged. As so conceived, it was easy for him to regard labor as the natural complement of prayer. It was not mere drudgery to be escaped, if possible, but it was the divinely appointed means of his sanctification. His feeling toward his work was shown—with the

characteristic medieval grotesqueness—by the part that each craft chose to take in the Corpus Christi processions. He thus identified his work, however humble, with the great drama of redemption.

The religious element in the life of these Craft Guilds was so prominent that some writers have not hesitated to say that religion was the chief factor in maintaining the fraternal and altruistic spirit, the honesty of work, and high moral character for which Guild members were distinguished. They affirm that without this influence the Guilds could not have played their great rôle in the industrial and political life of Medieval Europe. It is at least beyond question that in the Middle Ages, the "age of faith," as it is sometimes called, the organized workmen were as frankly and devotedly religious as any of the other classes of society. There was no thought of alienation between them and the Church. They were normally religious, and, unlike the modern man, they could not conceive of religion apart from its historic institution, the Church. The Church was their Mother. She belonged to them as much as to the princes or rich merchants who gave vast sums into her treasury. The offerings of their Guild for the Church's beautifying had their place beside those of kings and queens. Their sons, as well as those of the nobles, had a place in her priesthood and episcopate. To the Guild brother the Church was a larger and more glorious brotherhood. She was a democracy in a world of inflexible social stratification. She ministered, also, to their highest instruction, their most exquisite esthetic delights, their sweetest solace, their noblest inspiration.

It is difficult to avoid instituting comparisons between these Medieval Guilds and our modern Labor Unions. They are as different as the modern spirit is different from the medieval. But in comparing them one cannot altogether escape the feeling that since the Middle Ages, which have exercised an irresistible fascination over men as different as

Scott and Ruskin and William Morris, some subtle change has taken place in human nature for which all our acquisitions of knowledge and wealth hardly compensate. At least so far as external appearances are concerned, we are not only less religious than our medieval ancestors, but also less genial and brotherly and happy. Religion and conviviality do not blend so readily with us as with them. We have inherited centuries of training in individualism. We have lost much of the corporate sense or communal feeling which enriched the life of the medieval man. We have an unbrotherly way of looking at things and of doing things, which largely spoils many of the costly products of our modern civilization.

It is easy to idealize an age or institution long past, and no doubt the records that we possess of the life of the Guilds preserve their most attractive features. But one thing is evident. As compared with our Labor Unions, they took a more comprehensive view of what constitutes the welfare of the craftsman. They were not content with shorter hours and better pay and industrial freedom, but they provided a pleasant social life for him, and they secured for him participation in all those refining and uplifting influences which the Church ministers to society.

There is reason to believe that the lack of religious influence in our labor organizations, their failure to appeal properly to the spiritual nature, weakens their corporate life, renders them less efficient as mutual-benefit societies, and less self-controlled and considerate of the rights of others in times of industrial strife. It may be questioned whether, without summoning religion or some other spiritual influence, they can develop that fraternal and altruistic temper which all intelligent Socialism presupposes.

It is interesting to recall that it was as an antidote to Socialism that Pope Leo XIII., in an encyclical on *The Condition of Labor* published in 1891, advocated a return to

the spirit and form of organization of the Medieval Guilds. His admonition met with response in certain quarters, but it is impossible to revive an institution so long dead, and suited to a different social and industrial environment.

The Early Dutch Anabaptists

By

Henry Elias Dosker

THE EARLY DUTCH ANABAPTISTS

BY HENRY ELIAS DOSKER, PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY,
PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

(Read December 30, 1909)

SINCE 1885, when Ludwig Karl Keller published his *Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien. In ihrem Zusammenhange dargestellt* (Leipzig), the question of the true origin of the Anabaptists has been a matter of debate. With considerable ingenuity and show of reason, Keller argues for the historical genesis of the sect from the well-known medieval movements of the Petrubrusians, the Apostolic Brothers, the Arnoldists, the Humiliati, the Lollards, the Spirituals, the Friends of God, the Brethren of the Common Life, the Waldensians, the Moravian Brethren, and the German Mystics. Kolde and Carl Mueller have shown the untenability of this theory, and yet it is appealed to again and again by that class of Baptist historians who endeavor to set up for their theological views a quasi apostolic succession.

Sober historians see in the Anabaptist movement rather a "fanatical ultra reformatory tendency," which revealed itself first in Germany in the so-called "Wittenberg fanaticism" of 1521-1522, which was quelled by Luther's return from the Wartburg, which later on associated itself with the atrocious Peasant War and through the collapse of this movement and the scattering of its remaining leaders nestled itself in various European countries. It is not my aim in

this paper to review the history of the Anabaptists in this broader environment, but rather to call attention to some phases of their operation in the Netherlands, prior to the internal reformation wrought among them, by the saintly Menno Simons, since 1536.

The question of baptism has evidently been a moot subject of debate from the earliest days of Christianity, since no definite rules, either as regards its essence or rite, were laid down in the New Testament. The testimony of the Fathers and of the Councils of the Church would seem to indicate that pedobaptism and adult baptism, immersion and affusion and sprinkling, have ever been debated and debatable points. Since Ravenna 1311, the Church however has practically substituted sprinkling for immersion; whereas immersion had been the general practice of the Church up to that date. The change was evidently brought about by the natural falling off of adult baptism, through the cessation of the European missionary period, by climatic conditions and by the view generally adopted that, if children were to be baptized at all, they were naturally to be looked upon as "clinics." The Dutch Anabaptists followed the general practice, and although they rejected infant baptism and demanded a personal faith as the prerequisite of the sacrament, they knew absolutely nothing of immersion.

In a letter from the hand of Dr. S. Cramer, the great Mennonite scholar of the City-university of Amsterdam, to the author of this paper, dated Oct. 19, 1909, in reply to the question whether he had ever found a trace of immersion among the continental Anabaptists, he says: "No, neither the Dutch nor the German Anabaptists or 'Doopsgezinden' have known immersion. There was one case at St. Gall and one at Augsburg of eccentric people. Further no one in the 16th century thought of it. About this there can be no difference of opinion. Only after 1641, after the English Baptists had adopted this rite from the Dutch Collegi-

ants, as the latter had adopted it from the Silezian Socinians, in a few of the Dutch Mennonite congregations, this baptism by immersion has occurred very sporadically. De Hoop Scheffer has proved all this. See his article on Mennonites and Baptists' in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie* Whatever the Baptists have formerly said about immersion among us, in the 16th century, is fictitious and untrue."

This testimony is accentuated by the fact that in all the Martyriology, of the Dutch Anabaptists, reprinted in Vol. III. of the monumental work of Drs. Cramer and Pyper, *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, and in the extended discourse on "True and False Baptism," in Vol. V. of the same series, the subject of immersion is not so much as mentioned.

After 1533 the Dutch Anabaptists fell apart in two wings; the one quiet, God-fearing, with strong but sober convictions of the truth, the other wildly fanatic and revolutionary. Both of these parties furnished their quota of martyrdoms, under the severe "Placards" of the Government, but the fanatic party for a few brief years caused a tremendous commotion in Northern Europe.

The earliest Anabaptist martyrdom occurred in 1527, but the movement grew and in 1531 nine men were apprehended in Amsterdam and decapitated at The Hague, on the single ground that they were Anabaptists. All these martyrs gave evidence of thorough piety and met death with joy. Meanwhile the Saxon Anabaptists had begun to promulgate their views of the near advent of the millennium. Melchior Hoffmann was one of the disciples of Münzer, who lost his life in the Peasant War. He came to Embden in 1531, but naturally filled with the "Wanderlust," he soon departed for Strasburg, where he died in prison. From the disputation between him and the Strasburg theologians, reprinted in Vol. V. of the *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* we learn some of Hoffmann's views. He denied that Christ assumed his human nature from the Virgin

Mary; Christ was to him neither God nor man, but what some of the Germans would call to-day an "Uebermann." He claimed absolute free will, as over against the divine sovereignty. He denied the possibility of the forgiveness of any sin, which had been knowingly committed. He claimed that pedobaptism was from the devil and that adult baptism constituted the only true bond between all true believers. As has been said above, he was left to languish in prison till his death.

Before he left Embden he had appointed Jan Tryp-maker as his successor, who was apprehended on a trip to Amsterdam and was presumably one of the seven above mentioned, who were decapitated at The Hague in 1531. From the following of this man arose one Jan Mathysen, a baker of Haarlem, who claimed to be Enoch and moved to Amsterdam. Strange how all these men were attracted by the chief point of danger, as the moth is by the candle-light. From this point he sent out his disciples, two by two, to make propaganda for the Anabaptist cause. Among these disciples belonged Obbe Filips, who became the chronicler of the early Dutch Anabaptists and who also ordained Menno Simons, who was destined to become the reorganizer and savior of the party. But among these pairs, sent out from Amsterdam, belonged also Jan of Leyden and Gerrit Bookbinder, who were sent to Münster in 1533. The story of the Münster catastrophe is too well known to need repetition here. We only point out the fact of the relation of this disastrous event in the history of the Reformation to the Dutch Anabaptist movements. The whole thing originated in Amsterdam; it was made possible by a very considerable influx of Dutch Anabaptists, who between 1533 and 1534 moved from Holland to Münster. When the party there had gained sufficient strength, fanatic members of the sect suddenly burst out upon the streets of Münster, crying—"Get out, O ye godless ones, unless ye want to be exterminated, for every one who refuses to be baptized shall be

killed." Then came the exodus of all who refused to join the rebels, the cruel siege, the unspeakable shame of Münster, the wild vagaries of Jan of Leyden, the final collapse of the defence or rather the surprise of the city, the horrid vengeance on the Anabaptist leaders, and the reversal of the city to the papacy. How strong was the support of the brief millennial dream at Münster appears from the fact that hundreds of Anabaptists were halted at Amsterdam, April 21, 1534, when they were on the point of sailing for Overijssel, whence they intended to march on Münster. On the very next day four Anabaptists, with gleaming swords, ran stark naked through the city crying—"In the name of God. God's blessing hangs over the right side of the city, his curse over the left side." The men were apprehended and summarily executed. Similar scenes were enacted at Haarlem and The Hague. The whole northern part of the country seemed to be laboring under a strange and fanatic excitement; revolution was in the air. The fate of Münster was still unsettled and the fanatic element among the Anabaptists seemed ready for any kind of wild enterprise. Strong measures, in the shape of frequent executions of the ring-leaders of the contemplated outbreak, for a season preserved the peace of Amsterdam. In a placard issued about this time the Anabaptists are called "Melchiorites." It commands the authorities everywhere to hound them out, to execute the impenitent and to compel the penitent to stay in their places of abode for a whole year, with the exception of those—strange proof of the commercial spirit of the nation—who were engaged in the herring fishery. Thus the tendency of the Dutch Anabaptists to succor Münster was curbed and the millennial reign of the Dutch tailor Jan Bokkelszoon of Leyden became a horrid memory. From two books, of which a few copies are still in existence, printed at Münster in 1534 and 1535 ("Eine Restitution edder eine Wedderstellinge rechter unde gesunder Christlicker Leer, Gelouen unde Leuens, uth Godes genaden, durch de Gemeynthe

Christi tho Münster an den dach gegeben;" "Von Verborgtheit der Schrift des Rykes Christi unde von dem dage des Heren, durch to Gemeynthe Christi tho Münster"), we can gain an idea of the theology of the fanatic Münster Anabaptists. They were justly called "Melchiorites," for their theology was almost wholly the same as that of Melchior Hoffmann. They conceived the millennium of the Revelation as realized in their experience. All human authority, though of divine origin, may be resisted if it demands anything contrary to the doctrine of Christ. They believed in justification in the Roman Catholic sense, as a process rather than as a divine act. The sacraments were viewed in the Zwinglian rather than in the Lutheran sense. Pedobaptism was utterly rejected. As regards the humanity of Christ, they believed that his body had passed through Mary as light passes through glass. Polygamy was warranted by the Scriptures, although it was no longer customary in their day. Münster fell in 1535 and a little less than a year later Jan of Leyden, Kregting, and Knipperdolling, the survivors of the Anabaptist leaders, were executed with inhuman tortures, and their bones, inclosed in iron cages, were suspended from the top of St. Lambert's steeple. But this dreary ending of the Münster millennium did not end the fanaticism of the Dutch Anabaptists.

In 1535 an attempt to take the city of Leyden was discovered in time to frustrate the plot and fifteen men and five women suffered death in consequence. In Amsterdam, in October of the same year, Dirk the Snyder, with six other men and five women, burned every stitch of their clothing and ran naked through the streets of the city, yelling at the top of their voices—"Woe, woe, woe, the wrath of God, the wrath of God!" It is a curious fact that apparently every attempt at rebellion was introduced by these Dutch fanatics, through nude prophets. It was so at Münster, three times repeated at Amsterdam, and in several other cases. When these "Naaktloopers" at Amsterdam were ap-

prehended, they steadfastly refused to be clothed, saying that they were the naked truth and the images of God and therefore ashamed of nothing. Afraid of a general uprising, the authorities kept the gates of the city closed and doubly manned, and the fanatics were executed on the 25th of October. That this outbreak was a true attempt at revolution was proved by the fact that nearly a thousand Anabaptists appeared before the city, who were, however, easily dispersed. Almost simultaneously, in the eastern part of the country, a similar outbreak occurred, in which the old convent of Bolsward, in Frisia, fell into the hands of the fanatics, who destroyed its beautiful images and paintings in an iconoclastic frenzy. The revolt was speedily quelled, however, in a torrent of blood, by Jurgen Schenk, stadholder of Frisia. To prove that the air was literally filled with a spirit of fanatic revolt, it is a matter of history that before the close of the year 1535 another effort was made to surprise the city of Amsterdam, notwithstanding the failure of a similar attempt only a few weeks before, as described above. The leader this time was Jan van Geelen, a man of parts, one of the very few who had escaped the massacre of the Anabaptist revolutionaries at Bolsward. Silently he gathered a considerable force of his co-religionists in the chief city of Holland. He ingratiated himself with the authorities, who of course did not suspect his identity, and chose the time of the annual feast of the guild of the "Brothers of the Cross" to accomplish his purpose.

It was decided to surprise the city by night. Whether with any ground or not was never known, but the Anabaptists were of the opinion that the majority of the citizens were on their side. The bell in the city-hall was to ring out the signal of a general attack. Towards night, in the midst of the guild-festivities, the burgomasters were advised of the intended coup, apparently through the treason of one of the Anabaptists. They were more or less in their cups and pertinaciously refused to believe the warning until in their

wranglings so much time had elapsed that about fifty of the Anabaptists had actually appeared on the Dam, the great open space before the city-hall, and had surprised the guards of the building before the burgomasters were aware of their mortal danger. They escaped, by a rear entrance, in the nick of time, whilst the watch was killed behind them. The fright of a drunken constable, who climbed into the tower to save his life and drew up the rope of the bell after him, in the insane dread that his pursuers might utilize it to reach his place of concealment, was the means of saving the city. Naturally the tocsin never sounded and the general attack was therefore never made. Quietly the city-militia were summoned and all streets leading to the Dam were completely closed. In an attack on the rebels made by one of the burgomasters, Pieter Kolyn, and a party of citizens, the latter were crushingly defeated and the leader lost his life. At break of day another attack was made with better success. The Anabaptists were swept from the open plain into the city-hall, which was taken by assault, in which nearly all the rebels were killed. Twelve were taken captive and were publicly executed with that barbarity for which the times were noted. This incident will help us to understand the fact that, of all the cities of Holland, Amsterdam was the last, a few years later, to take the side of the Prince of Orange. Münster was wholly lost and Amsterdam nearly so to the cause of the Reformation by the excesses of the fanatic Anabaptists. The government now was thoroughly aroused to the danger of this fanatical sect and spared no pains to weed them out. A systematic search for Anabaptists was made in all the chief cities and whenever found they were punished with great severity, especially in Amsterdam, Utrecht, Leyden, and Hoorn, as also in the smaller cities of the northern provinces. This course, says Wagenaar, "soon caused the Anabaptists to relinquish the hope of founding a millennial kingdom" in Holland. The Anabaptist colony in England was greatly augmented by this persecution.

Wagenaar tells us that even before its inauguration, immediately after the failure of the attempt on Amsterdam, two shiploads of Anabaptists came to anchor off the harbor of the city, but when they learned that the plans of their leaders had miscarried, they immediately set sail for England and were seen no more.

Menno Simons, who in 1536 began his work for the reformation of the Dutch Anabaptists, earnestly warned against all resort to arms on the part of his followers and so completely regenerated them that they became noted for their passive resistance and their almost fanatical dread of arms, war, swearing, and all manner of violence. The very word "Anabaptist" prior to 1536 and subsequent to this period forms a study in antitheses. As was said above there always had been a stratum of better-minded Anabaptists from the very beginning of their historic career and these of course shared the cup of bitter persecution with their fanatic brethren. In a little more than one year—1534–1535,—in The Hague alone, more than sixty Anabaptists were executed, whilst six hundred received grace after they had abjured their faith. The records of the Dutch Inquisition, covering those early years, would seem to indicate that, contrary to general opinion, the judges were most lenient with those who could be persuaded to recant, and that literally no pains were spared to bring about such recantation. This is my conviction after studying the book of Anabaptist martyrdoms. Of course, as we all know, things became different after the Spanish Inquisition, under Alba, had taken matters in hand.

The Anabaptist wave of the Dutch Reformation was altogether elementary. They were, whatever they may have been or done, the pioneers of the movement. They were to be followed by the Sacramentists, who in turn were to give way to the stability and strength of Calvinism, the reformatory type which was best adapted to the national spirit.

The story of the Anabaptist movements in Holland is

full of romance, of violent change, of wild enthusiasm, of dramatic situations, and, in its later or reformed stage, is characterized by that latent strength, by that marvellous conservation of force, which later was to mark the Quaker movement in England, with which it stands unquestionably historically connected.

Rude and crude as they often were, the Dutch Anabaptists were the heralds of the dawn of the day of liberty, political as well as religious, in the land of the dikes.

The Marian Exiles

By

George Edwin Horr

THE MARIAN EXILES

BY GEORGE EDWIN HERR, PRESIDENT OF THE NEWTON
THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION, NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

(Read December 30, 1909)

THE circumstance that immediately after the death of Mary the English people welcomed the accession of the Protestant Elizabeth, precludes the theory that the return to Romanism under Mary indicated any thorough devotion on their part to the Pope or to mediæval religion.

The reasons of the recoil toward Romanism after the death of Edward are plain enough without resort to that assumption. In the first place, Somerset had fallen. Somerset, with all his faults, was a strong man, and he had what Northumberland never had, a recognition by the nation, as a whole, of his rightful leadership. After the fall of Somerset the forces of religious reform lost their grasp of the political situation. In the second place, the spoliation of the churches under Edward VI. exasperated the people as the suppression and confiscation of the monasteries under Henry VIII. had never done. An English squire, who could look with equanimity on the sequestration of church lands, was angered beyond expression when the communion plate was seized and melted up, or when the brasses which commemorated his grandfather and had been given to the church by his father were torn away and sold for the profit of a king's agent. More than this there can be no doubt that the period of Protestant rule in the reign of Edward VI. had been a time in which moral restraints were greatly relaxed.

Latimer was a rhetorical preacher, but Latimer knew what he was talking about and he had a sense of perspective. One has only to dip into his sermons to find evidence enough as to the moral decline which accompanied the substitution of the new creed and the new sanctions for the old. The letters of Calvin to Somerset show the great anxiety this situation gave the Geneva leader. The so-called non-conformist conscience is not the product of a recent phase of evolution. A certain sober, God-fearing, practical religion characterizes the typical Englishman. We see it in the days of Edward III. almost as clearly as in the days of Edward VII. It was the misfortune of Protestantism under Edward VI. to be associated temporarily with loose morals. To crown all, the character and convictions of Mary were almost a determining factor. The daughter of Catherine of Aragon had little reason for looking on any type of Protestantism with favor. The wrongs her mother had suffered had been associated with the revolt of her father from the yoke of Rome. She herself had been declared illegitimate, and during the period of her early womanhood she had smarted under that outrageous stigma. And Mary had all the Tudor strength of purpose and impatience of opposition. To her mind her life would be well spent if she could bring England back to the Roman obedience, and atone for what she deemed the great sin of her father and of the nation.

Mary succeeded to the throne July 6, 1553. On August 18th she issued her first proclamation. (Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, p. 373.) It is cautious and tentative. She wishes her subjects to be of the old religion, but compulsion will not be used for the present at least. Irregular and unlicensed preaching is forbidden. The effect of this was to silence all the Protestant preachers in England. They could not obtain licenses from Gardiner, who had been created Lord Chancellor. Under this injunction Hooper was sent to the Fleet and Latimer to the Tower. The foreign refugees were ordered to leave Eng-

land. Cranmer was sent to the Tower, ostensibly for his complicity in the plot to make Lady Jane Grey Queen.

On the accession of Mary, it was plain that the clouds were gathering for a storm. During her reign there would be no safety for Protestant ministers in England. The idea of flight naturally suggested itself, but it was distasteful to many of these stout-hearted Englishmen. It seemed like faithlessness to a clear duty, like the desertion of a post in time of battle. But if they are to be condemned for flight we must also condemn the refugees, like A' Lasco and his company, who found a haven in England from the wrath of Charles and Philip; we must condemn the Romanists who fled from England under Elizabeth; we must condemn Brewster and Robinson who escaped to Holland to avoid the persecution that followed Brownists.

The opinion of the leaders was in favor of flight. When Cranmer was consulted he wrote: "I exhort you as well by Christ's commandment, as by the example of Him and His Apostles, to withdraw yourselves from the malice of your and God's enemies, into some place where God is most purely served, which is no abandoning of the truth, but a preserving of yourself to God and the truth, and to the society and comfort of Christ's little flock. And what you will do, do it with speed, lest by your own folly, you fall into the persecutors' hands." (*Cranmer's Remains*, i., p. 364.)

But a stouter heart than Cranmer's came to the same decision. During the reign of Edward, John Knox had been a royal chaplain. He found that his commission and his license to preach were not renewed, and the fact that his correspondence was intercepted made it clear that he was a marked man. It was clear, even to Knox, that he would serve the cause he loved better by saving his life than by a piece of foolhardy courage. "Some," he writes, "will ask: Why did I flee? Assuredly I cannot tell; but of one thing I am sure; the fear of death was not the chief cause. . . . By

God's grace I may come to battle before all the conflict be ended." (Knox, *Works*, iii., 120.)

At first the government made it easy for those who wished to leave England to do so. Latimer, for example, was given fair notice of his intended arrest, and he had ample opportunity to escape. Cranmer's friends urged him to go abroad, but he replied, according to Strype: It would be in no ways fitting for him to go away, considering the post in which he was; and to show that he was not afraid to own all the changes that were by his means made in religion in the last reign. It was not long, however, before Mary's government began to close the doors for escape.

A student of the Temple, who knew Whittingham intimately, wrote in 1603 a sketch of his life, which Professor Arber has reprinted. The following quotation opens a window into the life of the time:

"Presently Queen Mary being proclaimed, and a taste given of the alteration of religion, he forthwith resolved to go again beyond seas; and riding over London Bridge on his way to Dover, and thence to take shipping, he met Master (Thomas) Harding who wrote against (Bishop John) Jewel, on the Bridge; who, after salutations, asked him, Whither was he going? Master Whittingham answered that he was going beyond the seas.

"Master Harding demanding of him the cause, he answered: 'Did you not hear the Proclamation (Aug. 17, 1553) and how the whore of Rome is again erected among us?'

"To which Master Harding replied: 'Happy are you that go for so good a cause.'

"Master Whittingham and his company coming to Dover at night, whilst they were at supper the Host of the house told his guests that, after supper, he must carry (take) them before the Magistrate or Mayor of the town; to be questioned concerning the cause or errand of their going beyond the sea. For the Magistrate had received strict command from the (Privy) Council for the examination of every pas-

senger; and Master Mayor had strictly enjoined them (the innkeepers) to bring their guests to be examined as afore-said. Wherein the Host seeming to be more peremptory and precise, it made his news the more distasteful, and in part vexed his guests.

“Whilst they were in this anxiety, there being a fair greyhound waiting on the table for relief (food); Master Whittingham chanced to say: ‘Mine Host, you have a very fair greyhound.’ ‘I (Aye)’, said the Host, ‘this greyhound is a fair greyhound indeed, and is of the Queen’s kind.’

“‘Queen’s kind!’ said Master Whittingham, ‘what mean you by that? This is a strange speech. What good subject can endure to hear such words of his Sovereign? To have Her Majesty to be compared in kind with the kind of a dog!’ and said these words were very treasonable, and that he could not see how they could be excused, if they should not go and acquaint the Magistrate with it; and did further so aggravate the matter, even of purpose, as they did throw the Host into such a fear as he durst not once mention the carrying of them before the Magistrate any more; but was glad to be so freed from their encumbrance. By this means all the company escaping this interruption, they proceeded on their journey.” (*Troubles at Frankfort*, pp. 2, 3.)

About 800 persons who had been identified with the changes in religion during the reign of Edward sought safety in flight. Five of these were bishops—Poynet, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Bale; five more were deans—Cox, Horne, Haddon, Turner, and Sampson. Among the refugees were such prominent divines as Bullingham, Grindal, King, Sandys, Jewel, Reynolds, Pilkington, Newell, Knox, Gilby, Whittingham, and Foxe. Among the laymen were Sir Richard Morrison, Sir Anthony Cook, Sir John Cheke, and a Mr. Bertie whose wife was the Dowager Duchess of Suffolk.

The refugees went for the most part to Geneva and Zurich in Switzerland, to Strassburg and Frankfort and to Embden.

At Geneva, Calvin was beginning the long struggle with the forces that resisted his iron rule. Servetus was burned on October 27th, fourteen weeks after Mary came to the throne. At Zurich Bullinger had succeeded Zwingli, and Pellicanus held the chair of Hebrew. At Strassburg Peter Martyr had restored to him the chair of divinity which he had resigned in 1547 to become professor of divinity at Oxford. At Frankfort, Viret and Musculus were leaders, and Melanchthon, who lived until 1560, was a familiar figure in all the cities of the Rhine valley. But the leader of all the Protestant theologians was Calvin, and Geneva was the intellectual capital of the reformed faith.

In all these places the English refugees were welcomed. Some of the English had sufficient property to provide for their necessities; others were helped by friends in England; others found work in the printing establishments of Strassburg, Zurich, and Basle; but many were dependent, for a time at least, upon the hospitality of their foreign brethren. Peter Martyr, for example, seems to have kept an open house. Undoubtedly, however, there was much hardship, for these 800 men and women, for the most part had been delicately bred. They represented what was best in the scholarly life of England.

For the five years of Mary's reign these refugees remained abroad, but immediately on the accession of Elizabeth (Nov. 24, 1558) almost to a person they made their way back to England. But they did not return the same men and women that they had been on the death of Edward. They came back with ideas and purposes that were destined to modify profoundly the course of English history.

Our knowledge of the life of these exiles during this five-year period comes from three main sources, in addition to Strype's *Memorials: The Zurich Letters*, published by the Parker Society; Knox's well-known pamphlet *The Troubles at Frankfort*; and *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort*, generally attributed to William Whittingham.

The last was recently edited by Professor Arber, but it has been the property of scholars for many years. A first edition is in the Boston Public Library.

It is clear that during this five-year period the minds of the exiles had been moved in three directions.

In the first place, they had come to distrust the necessity for uniformity of worship. The question arose among the exiles at Frankfort, who had been permitted to worship with the French Protestant refugees in the Church of the White Ladies, on condition that the English should conform to the French in doctrine and ceremonies. Both parties made concessions. The English subscribed to the French confession, and the French surrendered the use of the litany, the wearing of the surplice, and the practice of audible responses by the congregation. An order of worship was drawn up and put into use.

The Frankfort church, rejoicing in their privileges and unity, invited the brethren at Strassburg, Zurich, and Basle, to join them and make Frankfort the rallying point of all English exiles. The White Ladies' convent had been granted them on April 19, 1554. This letter was dated August 2d.

The Zurich group replied that the action of the Frankfort church in departing from the second prayer-book of Edward VI. (Nov. 1, 1552) was unwarrantable, and that any other form of worship was not to be permitted.

Several compromises, such as the temporary use of the Genevan form, having failed, Knox and Whittingham translated a syllabus of the second prayer-book of Edward VI. into Latin and sent it to Calvin for his opinion. Calvin's reply was friendly to the position of the Frankfort church, though it is clear that he thought both parties were making too much of trifles. A *modus vivendi*, however, was reached at Frankfort by making selections from the Genevan and Anglican forms. The Frankfort congregation was worshipping in this way until Dr. Richard Cox, who had been Tutor and Almoner to

Edward VI., and a party of staunch friends of King Edward's book arrived in Frankfort, March 3, 1555 (Hooper had been burned Feb. 9, 1555), and reopened the whole controversy. Up to this time the prayer-book men were in a minority at Frankfort. Knox, the pastor, adopted the strange course of advocating the admission of Cox to church membership, against the judgment of the church. Knox's appeal prevailed, and no sooner had they become members than they turned Knox out of his ministry. "Knox had let them in, and they had put him out." The bitterness of the Cox party against Knox is shown by the fact that it secured the banishment of Knox from Frankfort by accusing him of treason on the basis of a paragraph referring to Charles V., Philip II., and Queen Mary in his book, *The Admonition of Christians concerning the Present State of England*. Henceforth Frankfort was established on the prayer-book basis. The point to be observed however is that the issue as to the necessity of a uniformity of worship had been raised. Many of the exiles did not agree with the position taken by the majority of the Frankfort church.

Just before the return of the exiles to England, the English church at Geneva sent a general letter to all the English exiled churches on the Continent (Dec. 9, 1558), which was practically an invitation to combine for the abolition of ceremonies. The answer of the Frankfort church shows conclusively that the whole question of ceremonies had come to take a secondary place in their minds. The Frankfort letter says: "For where all the Reformed Churches differ among themselves in divers ceremonies, and yet agree in the Unity of Doctrine; we see no inconvenience, if we use some ceremonies diverse from them, so that we agree in the chief points of our religion." (P. 226.)

This is the clearest possible statement of the conviction that the unity of the Church was to be found in spiritual agreements rather than in identity of ritual, which comes near the heart of the historic Puritan position.

An important result of this movement of thought was that the Marian exiles on their return to England could easily become Puritan Conformists or Nonconformists, but they could not support with enthusiasm the Act of Uniformity (June, 1559).

A second direction in which the minds of many of the exiles had moved was in favor of a democratic organization of the church. This issue also arose in Frankfort.

After the departure of Knox and his sympathizers for Geneva, Cox joined Peter Martyr at Strassburg, and David Whitehead became pastor of the Frankfort church in association with Robert Horne.

Almost immediately after Cox left Frankfort, Horne and Ashley, a layman, got into a heated argument at a social party, and Ashley was charged with "contempt of the ministry." Ashley was summoned before the board of elders, but he appealed to the congregation. This raised a new issue. It was no longer about forms of worship, but about government. Where should ultimate authority reside? In the board of elders or in the congregation? The party of Horne and Chambers, who had charge of the poor-fund, stood for the oligarchical principle; the party of Ashley for the democratic. In the end Ashley's party won, and Horne and Chambers withdrew to Strassburg. Thus the Frankfort church became congregational, twenty-five years before Robert Browne published *A Book Which Sheweth*. In the discussions at Frankfort as to the authority of the congregation as opposed to the authority of the minister, one finds clearly stated the various issues that were subsequently raised in England between the Establishment, the Presbyterians, and the Independents. At Frankfort the exiles had been at school in ecclesiastical polity.

Another direction in which the minds of the exiles moved during their stay on the Continent was towards Calvinism. As we have seen, most of them had been either in Frankfort, Zurich, or Geneva. The Lutherans had, on

the whole, proved inhospitable. The influences under which they had lived were those proceeding from Bullinger, Peter Martyr, and Calvin, but Calvin's was by far the most potent. He was the great theologian, the author of the most positive and comprehensive scheme of doctrine the whole Reformation movement produced. To touch him was to become magnetized with his personality and charged with his ideas. In that mood many of the exiles returned. They were convinced Calvinists.

A superb opportunity awaited them when they reached England. The execution of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity cleared the English bench of bishops. Out of the fifteen living Marian bishops only Kitchin of Llandaff submitted. There were twenty-five English sees, and of these twenty-four were now vacant. The great bishoprics and deaneries, the great places at Oxford and Cambridge, were all vacant. How were these places to be filled? It was notorious that the interests of education had suffered greatly under the Marian régime. The best educated men in England, the men most competent for these posts, were the Marian exiles. Elizabeth ran a great risk in putting these men in places of power. She understood it perfectly, but she must have able men in these places, and she ran the risk. And some of the greatest places in the Established Church were filled by the Marian exiles. Grindal became successively Bishop of London, in the place of Bonner, then Archbishop of York, then Archbishop of Canterbury; Sandys became Bishop of Worcester, and then Archbishop of York; Bentham, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; Cox, Bishop of Ely; Horne, of Winchester; Jewel, of Salisbury; Parkhurst, of Norwich; Pilkington, of Durham; and Scory, of Chichester and Hereford. Among the exiles Cole, Humphreys, Nowell, Sampson, and Whittingham became Deans; Thomas Bacon, Robert Crowley, John Fox, William Kethe, and John Olde were influential

writers; and Sir Francis Knollys became Queen Elizabeth's Puritan Privy Councillor.

All these bishops took the Oaths of Supremacy and of Uniformity, and undoubtedly they intended to be loyal to their vows. But in the disorganized condition of English sees there was a wide margin for various practices. Even the prayer book was not so explicit as it seemed and Calvinism could easily be reconciled with the Articles.

It was inevitable that the lessons these men learned at Zurich and Geneva and Frankfort would not be forgotten. And it is not at all strange that within seven years after the accession of Elizabeth, when Archbishop Parker under the pressure of Cecil and the Queen attempted to secure uniformity of ceremonial, the Puritan party came into being, gradually dividing into the Conforming and the Nonconforming Puritans.

The Marian exiles brought into the Church of England a religious zeal born of the experiences of the exile; an indifference to ceremonial that was certain to develop into actual hostility to a compulsory ritual; a view of church government that in the minds of many was unfriendly to prelacy, and a Calvinism that colored all religious thought down to the time of Charles I.

LIST OF MEMBERS

ADDISON, DANIEL DULANY, Episcopalian, Rev.; rector of All Saints' Church, Brookline, Mass.; D.D. (Union College, 1901).

AYER, JOSEPH CULLEN, JR., Episcopalian, Rev.; professor of Church History in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia; Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1893).

BUCKLEY, JAMES MUNROE, Methodist, Rev.; editor of *The New York Christian Advocate*; D.D. (Wesleyan University, 1869), LL.D. (Emory and Henry College, 1882).

BURR, GEORGE LINCOLN, layman; professor of Medieval History in Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; LL.D. (University of Wisconsin, 1904), Litt.D. (Western Reserve University, 1905).

CARTER, JAMES, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Church History and Sociology in Lincoln University, Chester Co., Pa.

CHRISTIAN, JOHN TYLER, Baptist, Rev.; pastor of the Second Baptist Church, Little Rock, Ark.; D.D. (Bethel College, Ky. 1890), LL.D. (Keachie College, La., 1898).

CHRISTIE, FRANCIS ALBERT, Unitarian layman; professor of Church History in Meadville Theological Seminary, Pa.; D.D. (Amherst College, 1909).

COE, EDWARD BENTON, Reformed (Dutch), Rev.; senior minister of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1881), LL.D. (Rutgers College, 1893), S.T.D. (Yale University, 1885).

- CORWIN, EDWARD TANJORE, Reformed (Dutch), Rev.; res. North Branch, New Jersey; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1872).
- DEMAREST, WILLIAM HENRY STEELE, Reformed (Dutch), Rev.; president of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1901).
- DE WITT, JOHN, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Church History in Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J.; D.D. (Princeton College, 1877), LL.D. (Hanover College, 1888).
- DOSKER, HENRY ELIAS, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Church History in Louisville Theological Seminary, Ky.; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1894), LL.D. (Central University of Ky., 1905).
- DWIGHT, HENRY OTIS, Congregationalist, Rev.; recording secretary of the American Bible Society, New York City; LL.D. (Amherst College, 1896).
- FAULKNER, JOHN ALFRED, Methodist, Rev.; professor of Historical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.; D.D. (Wesleyan University, 1897, Arcadia College, 1902).
- FERGUSON, HENRY, Episcopalian, Rev.; rector of St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.; LL.D. (Trinity College, 1900).
- FERREE, BARR, Publisher, New York City.
- FLICK, ALEXANDER CLARENCE, Methodist layman; professor of European History in Syracuse University; Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1901), Litt.D. (Otterbein University, 1904).
- FORSANDER, NILS, Lutheran, Rev.; professor of Theology in the Augustana Theological Seminary, Paxton, Ill.; D.D. (Augustana College, 1894).
- FOSTER, FRANK HUGH, Congregationalist, Rev.; professor of History in Olivet College; Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1882), D.D. (Chicago Theological Seminary, 1894, Olivet College, 1909).

- FRITSCHER, GEORGE JOHN, Lutheran, Rev.; professor of Church History in Woodbury Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa.
- GOOD, JAMES ISAAC, Reformed (German), Rev.; professor of Reformed Church History and Liturgics in the Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, O.; D.D. (Ursinus College, 1887).
- HOOD, EDMUND LYMAN, Congregationalist, Rev.; president of Atlanta Theological Seminary; Ph.D. (New York University, 1899).
- HORR, GEORGE EDWIN, Baptist, Rev.; president of Newton Theological Institution; D.D. (Brown University, 1896).
- HULBERT, HENRY WOODWARD, Congregationalist, Rev.; pastor of the High Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.; D.D. (Middlebury College, 1900, Marietta College, 1900).
- JACKSON, SAMUEL MACAULEY, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Church History in New York University; LL.D. (Washington and Lee University, 1892), D.D. (New York University, 1893).
- JACOBS, HENRY EYSTER, Lutheran, Rev.; dean of the Mt. Airy Lutheran Theological Seminary, Phila., Pa.; D.D. (Pennsylvania College, 1877), LL.D. (Thiel College, 1892), S.T.D. (Muhlenberg College, 1907).
- JOHNSON, EDWARD PAYSON, Reformed (Dutch) Rev.; professor of Church History and Church Government in the New Brunswick Theological Seminary; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1896).
- JOHNSON, THOMAS CARY, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity in the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.; D.D. (Hampden-Sidney College, 1891), LL.D. (Hampden-Sidney College, 1899).

- KINSMAN, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Episcopalian; P. E. bishop of Delaware; D.D. (Berkeley Divinity School, 1909).
- LADD, WILLIAM PALMER, Episcopalian, Rev.; professor of Church History in the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.
- MACCRACKEN, HENRY MITCHELL, Presbyterian, Rev.; chancellor of New York University, 1891-1910; D.D. (Wittenberg College, 1878), LL.D. (Miami University, 1887, New York University, 1910).
- MCGIFFERT, ARTHUR CUSHMAN, Congregationalist, Rev.; professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Ph.D. (Marburg, 1888), D.D. (Western Reserve University, 1892, Harvard University, 1906).
- MCGLOTHLIN, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Baptist, Rev.; professor of Church History in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.; D.D. (Bethel College, 1898), Ph.D. (Berlin, 1901), LL.D. (Furman University, 1909).
- MILLER, EDWARD WAITE, Reformed (Dutch), Rev.; pastor of the Fifth Reformed (Dutch) Church of Albany, N. Y.; D.D. (Union College, 1892).
- MITCHELL, EDWIN KNOX, Congregationalist, Rev.; professor of Græco-Roman and Eastern Church History in Hartford Theological Seminary; D.D. (Marietta College, 1896).
- NORCROSS, GEORGE, Presbyterian, Rev.; pastor-emeritus of the Second Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa.; D.D. (Princeton College, 1879).
- O'CONNELL, DENNIS JOSEPH, Roman Catholic; auxiliary bishop of San Francisco, Cal.; S.T.D. (Propaganda, Rome, 1877).
- PATERSON, CHARLES GORDON, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Church History in San Francisco Seminary, San Anselmo, Cal.
- RAUSCHENBUSCH, WALTER, Baptist, Rev.; professor of Church History in Rochester Theological Seminary, N. Y.; D.D. (University of Rochester, 1902).

-
- REED, RICHARD CLARK, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Church History in Theological Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina; D.D. (King College, 1890), LL.D. (King College, 1906).
- RHINELANDER, PHILIP MERSER, Episcopalian, Rev.; professor of History of Religion and Missions in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
- RICHARDS, GEORGE WARREN, Reformed (German), Rev.; professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa.; D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, 1902).
- RIGGS, JAMES FORSYTH, Presbyterian, Rev.; pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, East Orange, N. J.; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1892).
- ROCKWELL, WILLIAM WALKER, Congregationalist, Rev.; assistant professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Lic. Theol. (Marburg, 1905).
- ROWE, HENRY KALLOCH, Baptist assistant professor of Church History, Newton Theological Institution; Ph.D. (Boston University, 1905).
- RUSTON, WILLIAM OTIS, Presbyterian, Rev.; dean and professor of Sacred Languages and Literature, German Presbyterian Theological School of the Northwest, Dubuque, Iowa; D.D. (Lenox College, 1886), LL.D. (Lenox College, 1907).
- SCRATCHLEY, HENRY PETER, Episcopalian, Rev.; res. Como, N. J.
- SEVERANCE, ALLEN DUDLEY, Presbyterian; professor of History, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
- SHELDON, HENRY CLAY, Methodist, Rev.; professor of Systematic Theology in Boston University; D.D. (Lawrence University, 1887).
- SHOW, ARLEY BARTHLOW, Congregationalist, Rev.; professor of Medieval History in Stanford University.
- SIMPSON, SAMUEL, Congregationalist, Rev.; res. Tolland, Conn. Ph.D. (Hartford Theological Seminary, 1902).

- SPIEKER, GEORGE FREDERICK, Lutheran, Rev.; professor of Church History, Old Testament Theology, and Introduction in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.; D.D. (Roanoke College, 1887).
- STUART, CHARLES MACAULAY, Methodist, Rev.; editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, Chicago, Ill.; D.D. (Garrett Biblical Institute, 1885, Wesleyan University, 1906), Litt.D. (Syracuse University, 1904, Ohio Wesleyan University, 1909), LL.D. (Nebraska Wesleyan University, 1909).
- TRYON, HAROLD HARRISON, Presbyterian; instructor in Biblical Philology and Church History in Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
- VEDDER, HENRY CLAY, Baptist; professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.; D.D. (University of Rochester, 1897).
- WALKER, WILLISTON, Congregationalist; professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University; Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1888), D.D. (Western Reserve University, 1894, Amherst College, 1895, Yale University, 1901, University of Geneva, Switzerland, 1909).
- WASHBURN, HENRY BRADFORD, Episcopalian, Rev.; professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, Mass.
- WEBER, HENRY JACOB, Presbyterian, Rev.; professor of Theology and Church History in the German Theological School of Newark, N. J. (Bloomfield, N. J.); Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1894), D.D. (German Theological School of Newark, N. J. 1909).

DECEASED MEMBERS

ALLEN, ALEXANDER VIETS GRISWOLD, died in Cambridge, Mass., Wednesday, July 1, 1908.

BACON, LEONARD WOOLSEY, died at Assonet, Mass., Sunday, May 12, 1907.

DRURY, JOHN BENJAMIN, died in New Brunswick, N. J., Sunday, March 21, 1909.

EWELL, JOHN LEWIS, died in Washington, D. C., Wednesday, March 16, 1910.

HULBERT, ERI BAKER, died in Chicago, Ill., Sunday, February 17, 1907.

JACKSON, GEORGE ANSON, died at Swampscott, Mass., Wednesday, May 8, 1907.

KROTEL, GOTLOB FREDERICK, died in New York City, Friday, May 17, 1907.

LEA, HENRY CHARLES, died in Philadelphia, Pa., Sunday, October 24, 1909.

LEWIS, ABRAM HERBERT, died at Westerly, R. I., Tuesday, November 3, 1908.

NICUM, JOHN, died in Rochester, N. Y., Monday, November 1, 1909.

ROGERS, JAMES WILLIAM, died at Walton, Ky., 1910.

SCOTT, HUGH McDONALD, killed by street accident in Chicago, Ill., Thursday, April 29, 1909.

SPAETH (PHILLIP FRIEDRICH) ADOLPH (THEODOR), died in Philadelphia, Pa., Sunday, June 26, 1910.

TIFFANY, CHARLES COMFORT, died at Northeast Harbor, Me., Tuesday, August 20, 1907.

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

--	--	--	--	--

270.06

A512

~~American society of church history.~~
AUTHOR

~~Papers. 2nd series, v. 2~~
TITLE

27082

270.06

A512

American society of church
history.

Papers. 2nd series, v. 2

27082

